

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

The Classical Review

Editors (C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.B.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society

PROF. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A.

PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

K. J. MAIDMENT, M.A.

F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)

PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)

J. D. DENNISTON, M.A., F.B.A., representing the Oxford Philologica Society

Representing the Council of the
Classical Association

With the co-operation of

PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, University of Adelaide, and
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto

Volume LXI

MAY 1947

Number 1

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	1
ΕΠΙΤΕΛΙΕΜΟΕΣ IN THE ARCHIDAMIAN WAR. F. E. ADCOCK	2
TWO NOTES ON PLATO'S <i>Philebus</i> . B. S. PAGE	8
THE STANDARD OF ARTAXERXES II. C. BONNER	9
CICERO, <i>Ad Fam.</i> viii. 8. 9. W. L. GRANT	10
ECHOES OF AESCHINES III IN DIO CASSIUS. H. W. PARKE	11
NOTES ON THE <i>Topica</i> OF ARISTOTLE. W. S. MAGUINNESS	11
TACITUS, <i>Agricola</i> , 34. 2. A. C. MOORHOUSE	12
REVIEWS:	
<i>Pindar</i> (Norwood), H. J. ROSE, 12; <i>L'Œuvre dans la tragédie grecque</i> (Duchemin), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 13; <i>Sophocles en het griekische Pessimisme</i> (Opstelten), A. M. DALE, 15; <i>Thucydides</i> (Finley), A. W. GOMME, 15; <i>Les Métaphores de Platon</i> (Louis), D. TARRANT, 17; <i>Discovering Plato</i> (Koyré), R. HACKFORTH, 18; <i>Dionysius of Halicarnassus</i> , V (Cary), A. H. McDONALD, 19; <i>A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives</i> (Buck and Petersen), P. B. R. FORBES, 21; <i>Genetivus und Ablativus Qualitatis</i> (Vandvik), E. C. WOODCOCK, 22; <i>Hyakynthos</i> (Mellink), H. J. ROSE, 23; <i>Prometheus: Die Geburt der Helena</i> (Kerényi), H. J. ROSE, 24; <i>Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens</i> (Beazley), T. B. L. WEBSTER, 25; <i>Le Mirage Spartiate</i> , II (Ollier), N. G. L. HAMMOND, 26; <i>Autour de Tibère</i> (Pippidi), R. MEIGGS, 27.	
SHORT REVIEWS	29
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	32
BOOKS RECEIVED	35

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 5s. net. Yearly subscription, 16s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$6.30

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

n
n
;
ll
rs

al
al
in
d
o-
n
n

c.
e
l,
of
l,
r,
d,

T

LA
Me
off
Pa
in
to
tri
co
is
tri
wh
ap
ou
Th
£2
th
E

C
fo
it
of
b
li
an
st
en
n
T
d
a
u
h
t
A
t
(
L
R

V
n
n
x
u
s
v
s

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

MAY 1947

NOTES AND NEWS

LAST year we drew attention to the *Mémorial des Études Latines* which was offered to Professor Jules Marouzeau of Paris by his fellow-Latinists of France in 1943. At that time it was not possible to associate foreign scholars with such a tribute. Their opportunity has now come, and a volume of *Mélanges*, which is now in preparation, will contain contributions from scholars outside France who wish to express in this way their appreciation of Professor Marouzeau's outstanding services to Latin studies. The subscription price of the volume is £2 (30 Swiss francs), which should be paid through a bookseller to Mlle Juliette Ernst, 52 Rüttimeyerstrasse, Basle.

The editors of the Danish journal *Classica et Mediaevalia*, which was founded in 1938 and has just entered on its eighth volume, appeal to the scholars of other countries to support it either by subscribing, directly or through libraries, or by contributing articles on any aspect of classical antiquity or its survivals. The journal, which is written entirely in English, French, and German, will appear in two parts each year. The publishers (Gyldendal, 3 Klareboerne, Copenhagen) will send on request a list of the articles contained in volumes i-vii. The first fascicule of vol. viii has articles by J. A. Bundegaard (E.) on the Building Contract from Lebedea, I.G. i. 3073, by Charles Vellay (F.) on the Kingdom of Laomedon, by H. Roos (G.) on Martin of Dacia, and by John Danstrup (E.) on Indirect Taxation at Byzantium.

The Spanish classical journal *Emerita*, which was last noticed here in 1937 (li. 161), when its future was doubtful, seems now to be firmly established. Volume xiii bears the title of 'Miscellanea Nebrija' in celebration of the fifth anniversary of the death of Antonio de Lebrixa, the humanist who brought Renaissance scholarship to Spain. The contents are

mainly concerned with him, his biography, his grammatical and historical work, and the influence of his teaching, and with various aspects of Spanish humanism. J. Mallon contributes a long article on the script of C.I.L. ii. 5411.

Important work is often overlooked because it appears in an unfamiliar publication. For this reason classical scholars and teachers in this country may be glad to hear of a recent article by Meyer Reinhold entitled 'Historian of the Classic World: a Critique of Rostovtzeff', which is published in the American quarterly *Science and Society*, vol. x (1946), pp. 361-91. In it the author undertakes 'a systematic analysis and critical appraisal of the historical methodology' of Rostovtzeff, the general thesis of which is that, while Rostovtzeff's work constitutes a momentous contribution 'towards a scientific understanding of ancient Mediterranean civilization', it is nevertheless strongly coloured by contemporary ideas and assumptions which have their origin in the society in which he was brought up. Mr. Reinhold's critique is a serious and acute study which deserves the careful attention of anyone interested in the wide historical issues which Rostovtzeff's works have raised.

W. M. C. writes: 'In 1932 the *Classical Review* (xli. 145 f.) welcomed translations into Turkish of portions of the works of three Latin authors, Horace, Tacitus, and Virgil—the last by Rushen Eshref, later Turkish Ambassador at the Court of St. James. Those translations were made from the French renderings in the Budé series; they encouraged us, in 1932, "to look forward to the fruition of a project already advocated by influential Turks, the introduction of Latin and Greek into the curriculum of the schools and colleges of Asia Minor". There is now an Institute of Classical Philology in the University of Istanbul,

and one of its lecturers, Faruk Zeki Perek, has undertaken the compilation of a Latin-Turkish Lexicon (*Lâtinçe-Türkçe Sözlük*). The first fascicule of 112 octavo pages runs from *A* to *Cella*, suggesting a total length of about 750

pages. The "learners" for whom the book is designed will find it well arranged, easy to read, and, to paraphrase the claim made in the author's preface, the Royal Road to the rich past of their own country.'

ΕΠΙΤΕΙΧΙΣΜΟΣ IN THE ARCHIDAMIAN WAR

PROFESSOR E. T. SALMON in an interesting paper in this journal (lx, 1946, pp. 13-14) has called attention to the statement in Herodotus ix. 73 that the Spartans, from a pious regard for a legendary service, abstained from harming Decelea, though they ravaged the rest of Attica, and argues that this was why they did not establish the *ἐπιτειχισμός* at Decelea until 413 B.C. A parallel that might be cited to support Herodotus' statement is to be found in Diodorus xii. 45. 1, where Diodorus, describing the second invasion, that of 430, says that the Lacedaemonians and their allies *πάσαν σχεδὸν τὴν γῆν ἐλυμήναντο πλὴν τῆς καλουμένης Τετραπόλεως*, and attributes their sparing of the Tetrapolis to the memory of benefits to their ancestors. The Tetrapolis does not include Decelea, but the statement is evidence for similar conduct from a similar motive. If, as seems reasonable, these decisions were those of King Archidamus they would also be in tune with the scruples he displayed when, in 429, the Plataeans appealed to their special position due to their territory being the scene of the great deliverance from the Persians and to the pronouncements of Pausanias after his victory.¹ Thucydides makes no reference to these exceptions to the general devastation, and indeed when he sums up the second invasion he says *καὶ τὴν γῆν πᾶσαν ἔτεμον*.² It might be possible to attempt a reconciliation by supposing that Herodotus refers only to the first invasion and that Diodorus has put the sparing of the Tetrapolis one year too late, but it is preferable to assume a lacuna in Thucydides' knowledge when he wrote that passage—a lacuna which was not

made good after a later inquiry—or an overstatement. This is perhaps borne out by ii. 55, if that chapter described the whole area devastated by the Peloponnesians in this invasion, and by iii. 26. 3, where it is said that in 427 the Peloponnesians ravaged 'what had been passed over in their earlier invasions'. This may have included the territory of Decelea and of the Tetrapolis. On the other hand, the phrase *ὅσα παρελείπτο* might not refer to deliberate abstentions. Had the Spartans reversed their policy about Decelea in 430 Herodotus would presumably know of it (for he certainly survived that year, as is shown by vii. 137. 3 compared with Thucydides ii. 67) and would hardly have written as he did. On the whole, it seems reasonable to suppose that, at least in the early years of the Archidamian War, the Spartans were induced by a kind of piety to leave Decelea alone.

Professor Salmon suggests that possibly the Athenians trusted to Spartan piety so far as to leave Decelea without protection. There is certainly no reference to any siege of the town in 413, and Thucydides speaks of the Peloponnesians as fortifying it,³ but this fortification is of the Decelea *place d'armes* which they established. Miss Chandler⁴ appears to be right in supposing that the fortifications at Palaiokastros (which are the right distance from Athens) are those which the Peloponnesians built. They measure about 800 metres in circumference and would accommodate a fair-sized force. But some two miles to the north, on the steep hill of Katsimidi, there are the ruins of a small but strong fortress of polygonal masonry. These seem rather too far away to be an

¹ Thucydides ii. 71-4.

² Id. ii. 57. 2.

³ Thucydides vi. 91. 6; vii. 18. 1, 27. 3, 42. 2.

⁴ *J.H.S.* xlv, 1926, p. 16.

outpost of a main fortified position, and it may be conjectured that, long before the Peloponnesian invasion, it had served as a refuge for the people of Declea and a fort to guard the important route from Euboea via Oropus which passes beneath it,¹ a route of lasting importance to Athens. It is to be remembered that the Spartans were not the only enemies of Athens, and the Boeotians would not be inhibited by Spartan pieties.

But whether or no the Athenians trusted to Spartan scruples to protect Declea and whether or no Alcibiades was speaking the truth if in fact he said what he is made to say in his speech at Sparta,² that the fortification of Declea was something of which the Athenians were (by that time) always most afraid, there remains a larger question. Granted that the position of Declea was exceptionally well suited to do harm to Athens if it was held by the Peloponnesians, it was not the only point at which an *ἐπιτειχισμός* could be established. What is of importance for the strategy of the Archidamian War is the fact that the Spartans did not establish an *ἐπιτειχισμός* anywhere in Attica in the whole course of it, and that is not explained by any reluctance to occupy and fortify Declea, whatever the cause of that reluctance may have been. This larger question deserves a fuller consideration than would be in place in Professor Salmon's paper, which is in the main concerned with Declea.

There is first to be considered the fact that an *ἐπιτειχισμός* in Attica would require a considerable effort. When at last the Spartans did embark on the *ἐπιτειχισμός* at Declea they began their preparations in the previous winter: *σίδηρόν τε περιήγγελλον κατὰ τοὺς ξυμμάχους καὶ τὰλλα ἐργαλεῖα, ἡτοίμαζον ἐς τὸν ἐπιτειχισμόν.*³ To build walls secure against ancient Greek siegecraft and to provide for the quarters of the garrison there would be needed *λιθολόγοι καὶ τέκτονες.*⁴ Contingents from the allies

of Sparta would have to take turns to help maintain a standing garrison,⁵ and the act of fortification itself would need to be covered by an army superior to whatever forces Athens could command. The maintenance of a garrison large enough not to be easily contained by a small Athenian force would tax the financial resources of the cities, if, as seems reasonable, the contingents were paid or their families indemnified for their absence from their farms during long periods. The movement of the contingents to and from the safe shelter of Boeotia, and of convoys of supplies, would need protection against attacks based on Athenian strong points like Oenoe, though perhaps the Boeotian army could provide this if the point chosen was not too distant from that border. Thus the operation would be one requiring much organization and effort, and, it is to be remembered, its effect would not be immediate, though in the long run it might prove very damaging to Athens. The Athenian food-supply was secure by sea, and even when Declea was occupied, King Agis had to endure seeing the Athenian cornships entering the Piraeus.⁶ Thus an *ἐπιτειχισμός*, despite all the harm it might do to Athens, was no short cut to decisive victory.

In the second place, the successful establishment and maintenance of an *ἐπιτειχισμός* postulated a considerable margin of military superiority in the field. The Peloponnesians must be able, with the help of Boeotia, to prevent the Athenians, at any time of year, from drawing lines of circumvallation round the *ἐπιτειχισμός* and making them strong enough to resist assault.⁷ For a besieged *ἐπιτειχισμός*, if the siege could be maintained, would be a liability and not an asset. The margin of superiority would need to be so great as to set off the advantage Athens could have in her

⁵ Id. vii. 27. 3; ii. 78. 2 (of the circumvallation of Plataea).

⁶ Xenophon, *Hell.* i. 1. 35.

⁷ Lines of circumvallation might be made defensible. The Athenians themselves, during two whole years, made no attempt on the fortified lines drawn round Plataea.

¹ Thucydides vii. 28. 1.

² Id. vi. 91. 6.

³ Id. vii. 18. 4.

⁴ Cf. id. iv. 69. 1; v. 82. 6; vi. 44. 1.

proximity and her freedom to strike when she saw a chance of success. There had to be this margin of superiority and the willingness not to reduce it by commitments elsewhere, however urgent might be representations of allies, whose immediate interests might make them support diversionary operations. What was needed, then, was a considerable organized effort, the readiness to provide supplies and some finance, a great and assured military superiority in the field, and some degree of self-confidence and resolute leadership aimed at a result that would be only slowly achieved.¹

These needs were so great that any higher command which hesitated to implement them would be very much tempted to find reasons why, at any given moment, the time was not ripe, and the habit of waiting till the time was ripe might induce an inability to seize a moment however propitious. Time, once wrote Professor Cornford, is, to some, like a medlar: it is never ripe until it is rotten. And in fact, besides these general considerations, there were in each year of the Archidamian War some reasons, often very good reasons, why, in that particular year, the attempt at an *ἐπιτειχιsmós* should not be made by the Peloponnesians and their allies.

In the first year of the war it was reasonable to adopt the time-honoured strategy of an invasion and partial devastation in case the Athenians would, after all, come out and fight for the country-side. Though part of the Athenian army was before Potidaea or in Chalcidice, Athens was still able that winter to invade the Megarid with 13,000 hoplites,² so that it was doubtful if there was enough permanent superiority in the field to justify the attempt at an *ἐπιτειχιsmós*. The devastation of a second invasion might perhaps exhaust Athenian patience. In the second

year, when the plague had started in Athens, the Peloponnesians were concerned to extend their devastations to parts of Attica they had not visited before. Thucydides reports, though with a hint of scepticism, that it was even said that fear of the plague induced the Peloponnesians to leave Attica earlier than they would otherwise have done.³ On the withdrawal of the invading army, it may be assumed that some Athenians at least returned to the open country,⁴ and very possibly took the plague with them, as Hagnon's army took it to Potidaea.⁵ Thucydides does not give this reason, or any other reason, for there being no invasion of Attica in 429, but it does not seem improbable that this was at least a contributory cause of the failure to take advantage of the present military weakness of Athens to establish a permanent fortified strong point in Attica.⁶ The fall of Pericles may have induced a hope that Athens would pass from rejected negotiations⁷ to surrender, so that no preparations for an *ἐπιτειχιsmós* were set on foot in the preceding winter. In any event, Plataea provided an alternative objective, though it is always possible that had Plataea surrendered or accepted the offers of Archidamus,⁸ the Peloponnesian army would then have marched into Attica.

In 428 B.C., when the first phase of the plague was over, or nearly over, the Athenians were active in hampering the movements of the Peloponnesians till their provisions gave out and they withdrew.⁹ A fair-sized force was occupied with the maintenance of the blockade of Plataea. Also when the Spartans, having accepted the Mityleneans as allies, summoned their allies to send contingents for a second invasion there was a general reluctance to take part in it, and the vigour of the Athenians

¹ In arriving at the general considerations advanced in this and the preceding paragraph I am much indebted to the suggestions of Mr. G. T. Griffith and Mr. Hammond. Mr. Hammond urged the difficulties that would attend an *ἐπιτειχιsmós*, Mr. Griffith underlined the need for a clear margin of military superiority.

² Thucydides ii. 31. 2.

³ Thucydides ii. 57. 1.

⁴ Id. vii. 27. 4 *πρότερον μὲν γὰρ βραχεῖαι γιγνόμεναι αἱ ἐσβολαὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον τῆς γῆς ἀπολαύειν οὐκ ἐκώλυον*. In 427 the Peloponnesians were concerned to destroy *εἰ τι ἐβεβλαστήκει* (id. iii. 26. 3).

⁵ Id. ii. 58. 2.

⁶ *Camb. Anc. Hist.* v, p. 211, refers to this year and not to the early months of the war.

⁷ Thucydides ii. 59. 2. ⁸ Id. ii. 72. ⁹ Id. iii. 1.

caused the project to be abandoned.¹ In 427 there was an invasion which is described as directed to new devastation and to waiting on events in Lesbos,² whither a fleet had been sent, though, as it proved, without effect. The siege of Plataea continued far into the summer, and this could be made at least an excuse to wait till that operation was over before embarking on a new one. The Boeotian army, so necessary to give close support to an *ἐπιτειχισμός*, would be most concerned to cover the siege of its especial enemy.

In 426 the Peloponnesians and their allies concentrated at the Isthmus for an invasion of Attica, but were turned back, Thucydides says, by many earthquakes.³ Since the event which heralded the great helot revolt in 464 B.C., the Spartans may have been exceptionally allergic to earthquakes. There was also a second outbreak of plague at Athens beginning in the preceding winter.⁴ During this year operations were drawn away from Attica by various enterprises, and, if an indication in the *Acharnians* may be trusted,⁵ there were movements to arrange a peace, though they came to nothing. In 425, though the Peloponnesians invaded Attica, they soon hastened home to cope with the Athenian *ἐπιτειχισμός* at Pylos; there was a period of truce, and then the Spartans taken on Sphacteria were held as hostages against an invasion of Attica. This state of affairs continued until the beginning of 421, including the period of the armistice of 423-422.

At last, at the beginning of 421, the Spartans did announce the project of an *ἐπιτειχισμός*.⁶ How seriously the project was entertained is a matter on which speculation is legitimate. The Spartan prisoners from Sphacteria were still held as hostages against an invasion of Attica, and, if this had deterred the Spartans hitherto, it is not easy to see why it should not still have an effect.

It is possible that the project was a demonstration of resoluteness arranged between the personages at Sparta and Athens who were most anxious to end the war by a peace, to be followed by an alliance between Sparta and Athens. The allies of Sparta might not welcome the toil and trouble of the operation; the more warlike Athenians might reflect on the harm the city would suffer if the project was put into effect with success, and realize that, once the Spartan prisoners had been put to death, their apotropaic virtue would end with their lives. At all events the project was cancelled by the peace.

It appears at least probable that even before the outbreak of hostilities the notion of an *ἐπιτειχισμός* or *ἐπιτείχιος*⁷ was in the air. In their second speech at Sparta the Corinthians are made to refer to it in the much-debated sentence *ὑπάρχουσι δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι ὁδοὶ τοῦ πολέμου ἡμῖν, ξυμμάχων τε ἀπόστασις, μάλιστα παραίρεσις οὐσα τῶν προσόδων αἷς ἰσχύουσι, καὶ ἐπιτειχισμός τῇ χώρᾳ, ἅλλα τε ὅσα οὐκ ἂν τις νῦν προΐδοι*.⁸ Many scholars have used this sentence as an argument for the view that the speech was written after the occupation of Decelea. The temptation to regard all *vaticinia* as *vaticinia post eventum* is always hard to resist, but Thucydides is concerned to offer us what was at least his evaluation of the situation at the time and the considerations that appeared valid then. When, in his first speech, Pericles answers this point in the Corinthian speech⁹ he is made to speak of an *ἐπιτείχιος* as something that needs to be argued about, and to speak of it in a context which seems to fit the unimpaired power of Athens rather than her position after the Sicilian Expedition. This would be admitted on any interpretation of the sentence beginning *τὴν μὲν γὰρ χαλεπὸν*, which no scholar has been able to

¹ Thucydides iii. 15. 2, 16.

² Id. iii. 26. 4.

³ Id. iii. 89. 1.

⁴ Id. iii. 87.

⁵ 647-53.

⁶ Thucydides v. 17. 2. As the reason given was *ὅπως οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι μᾶλλον ἑσακοῦσιν*, it is hard to see what else than an *ἐπιτειχισμός* in Attica was announced.

⁷ The word *ἐπιτείχιος* is one of those verbal nouns of which Thucydides is fond. If he made a distinction between this and *ἐπιτειχισμός*, *ἐπιτείχιος* may indicate a process, *ἐπιτειχισμός* a result. But this distinction is not clearly borne out by his use of the two words where they occur.

⁸ Thucydides i. 122. 1.

⁹ Id. i. 142. 3-4.

translate or emend so as to win general assent. The next sentence, *φρούριον δ' εἰ ποιήσονται, τῆς μὲν γῆς βλάπτειν ἂν τι μέρος καταδρομαῖς καὶ αὐτομολίαις*, has also been taken, because of *καὶ αὐτομολίαις*, to refer to the mass desertion of Athenian slaves to Decelea. But it is to be observed that the words appear to be an afterthought in a sentence framed without it, for *καταδρομαῖς* suits *τῆς γῆς μέρος τι* better than *αὐτομολίαις*. This would then imply that the sentence was originally drafted before Decelea or even before the occupation of Pylos, which led to an *αὐτομολία* of Helots.¹ Even if this is not so, and if the slight inconcinnity is merely a defect in style, it was not beyond the wit of man to conjecture what the effect of an *ἐπιτελιχισμός* in Attica might be.

Thucydides, on one possible, though perhaps not probable, interpretation of this and the preceding sentences taken together, makes Pericles draw a distinction between an *ἐπιτελιχισμός*, which is the effect of a city as a kind of pressure-point,² and the establishment of a fortified position. If *ἐπιτελιχισμός* is extended to cover both, then Athens had applied this kind of pressure during the First Peloponnesian War by her winning over of Troezen, for example. The second campaign of the Archidamian War opens on the Athenian side with what appears to be an attempt to recover, elsewhere, something that had been given up in the Thirty Years' Truce. Pericles led a strong force against Epidaurus.³ As a prolonged siege was precluded by the fact that it would be interrupted by the return of the Peloponnesian army, the enterprise must fail unless it succeeded quickly. It may therefore be conjectured with some plausibility that the Athenians hoped for help from within the city. If so, their calculation was refuted by events, but there may have been in-

trigues started before the first effects of the plague showed Athens to be for the time a falling market. Had this project succeeded, Epidaurus with an Athenian garrison to support a pro-Athenian government would have provided an *ἐπιτελιχισμός* τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ and incidentally might have affected the neutrality of Argos.

When the effect of the plague was wearing off, we find a number of Athenian attempts at an *ἐπιτελιχισμός* by way of a *φρούριον*, some of which were successful. The general model is a strong point on a coast, or an island near the coast, which could be supplied by sea or afford a way of retreat by sea, if need be. There was Pylos,⁴ which was a success, and Delium,⁵ which was a failure. In 425, besides Pylos, there were unsuccessful attempts to establish an *ἐπιτελιχισμός* in Corinthian territory,⁶ successful attempts at Methana⁷ between Epidaurus and Troezen, and, in 424, on Cythera off the Laconian coast.⁸ The Athenian occupation of the island of Minoa in 427⁹ was mainly directed against Megarian seaborne traffic, but it was a springboard three years later for something that proved to be an *ἐπιτελιχισμός* against Megara in the shape of the occupation of Nisaea, once that had failed to lead on to the winning over or capture of Megara itself.¹⁰ Finally, the terms of the armistice of 423 carefully provide for a kind of temporary sterilization of these various *ἐπιτελιχισμοί*.¹¹

The notion of an *ἐπιτελιχισμός* has some visible effects in the counsels of Athens' enemies during the Archidamian War. The Spartan settlement at Heraclea in Trachis¹² appeared to the Athenians to be a threat to Euboea, a *Lebensraum* of Athens, even though the threat came to nothing because of local opposition to the settlement. When the Spartan admiral Alcidas made his brief excursion into the eastern Aegean, he was urged by certain exiles from Ionia and Lesbians in his fleet to seize one

¹ Thucydides iv. 41. 3.

² Professor Gomme in his *Commentary on Thucydides*, I, p. 418, has pointed out that the Persian use of Thebes may be regarded as 'an instance of *ἐπιτελιχισμός* in another form'. A parallel to this would be the Athenian use of Catana as a half-way house to Syracuse in the Sicilian expedition.

³ Thucydides ii. 56.

⁴ Thucydides iv. 3 ff.

⁵ Id. iv. 42 ff.

⁶ Id. iv. 5. 3 ff.

⁷ Id. iv. 69. 1.

⁸ Id. iii. 92. 4, 93.

⁹ Id. iv. 90 ff.

¹⁰ Id. iv. 45. 2.

¹¹ Id. iii. 51. 1.

¹² Id. iv. 118. 4.

of the cities in Ionia or Cyme in Aeolis which might be a centre for disaffection in that part of the Athenian Empire, and, so they thought, might induce the Persian governor in Sardis to join in making war on Athens.¹ Exiles live on hopes, and these hopes may have been vain, even if Alcidas was the man to take risks to make them more than hopes. And when Alcidas was anxious to atone for arriving late by leaving early, Paches is said to have counted it a gain that, if he could not bring Alcidas to action in the open sea, he did not have to undertake a blockade and land operations against the Spartans driven to establish themselves in a kind of *ἐπιτειχισμός* against their will.²

Nor was the idea unknown to civil war. The defeated remnant at Corcyra promptly established themselves on the opposite mainland and then ventured to transfer themselves to Istos.³ The *stasis* at Colophon produced Notium almost impinging on Colophon.⁴ And when the whole war was over, democratic speakers at Athens may have described the oligarchic exiles established at Eleusis as an attempted *ἐπιτειχισμός*.

To return to the general question with which this paper attempts to deal: the true explanation why the Spartans did not make an *ἐπιτειχισμός* during the Archidamian War is not a scruple which would only have ruled out Decelea and possibly the Tetrapolis, nor is it that they had to wait for Alcibiades to suggest to them this method of injuring their enemies. It is rather to be seen in the difficulty of the operation, the need for a great margin of military superiority in the field, combined with particular reasons against action in any year, including, after Sphacteria, the fear of causing the death of the Spartans in Athenian hands.

With the Sicilian Expedition the case was altered. The battle of Mantinea had proved the truth of the legend of Spartan invincibility. The best of the Athenian army was abroad, and it was not plain that it would return. A shrewd

judge might speculate on the possibility that Athens would not cut her losses in Sicily in time to prevent losses in Greece. Between the fears of Nicias and the hopes of Athens there was a gulf in which armies whole might sink, as sink they did. The Athenian Empire had long outlived its need of Athens. If Persia was weak, Athens was not needed. If Persia was strong, it would be anti-Athenian. Agis, like Turenne, had become bolder with years and was ready to conduct war *οὐκ ἐκ παρόργου*.⁵ Boeotia had no great love for Sparta, but had less for Athens. The Corinthian *Fronde* had failed, and now the Corinthians were eager for an offensive against Athens herself. One Spartiate general had, to all seeming, turned the tide in Sicily. What Gylippus had done abroad, a Spartan king might do in Greece. The difficulty of the operation remained, but it was offset by a new spirit of determination. The Spartans themselves believed they had a better justification than in 431, and were 'zealous for the war'.⁶ Alcibiades had urged the establishment of an *ἐπιτειχισμός* at Decelea, and he could be trusted to know what would injure Athens most. The one thing that could force Athens to complete surrender was, it is true, not an *ἐπιτειχισμός* but the destruction of Athenian naval power. That might well seem an event out of reach, and it may be doubted if Alcibiades sought the capitulation of Athens so much as to produce a situation in which Athens would make peace with himself as mediator. But he would keep such notions to himself, and at the moment when the project of Decelea was taken in hand it must have appeared the most promising strategy for Sparta to adopt. Once embarked upon, it could not be abandoned and, beyond all doubt, it was the most effective way of employing the land forces of the Peloponnesian League, which would have no taste for distant campaigning beyond the borders of Greece proper.

F. E. ADCOCK.

King's College, Cambridge.

¹ Thucydides iii. 31. 1.

² Id. iii. 33. 3.

³ Id. iii. 85.

⁴ Id. iii. 34. Cf. the Samian exiles at Anaea (id. iii. 32. 2; iv. 75. 1).

⁵ Thucydides vii. 27. 4.

⁶ Id. vii. 18.

TWO NOTES ON PLATO'S *PHILEBUS*

15 α ὅταν δέ τις ἓνα ἄνθρωπον ἐπιχειρῇ τίθεσθαι καὶ βούν ἓνα καὶ τὸ καλὸν ἓν καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἓν, περὶ τούτων τῶν ἐνάδων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἡ πολλὴ σπουδὴ μετὰ διαιρέσεως ἀμφισβήτησις γίνεταί.—πῶς;—πρῶτον μὲν εἰ τις δέ τιναυτας εἶναι μονάδας ὑπολαμβάνειν ἀληθῶς οὔσας.

σπουδὴ <καί> Schütz σπουδὴ μετὰ <δέ> Badham (ed. 1) ἡ π. σ. <ῆ> Jackson σπουδὴ Madvig, R. G. Bury [σπουδὴ] Badham (ed. 2) που δὴ J. B. Bury που ἦδη Apelt.

THE problem of the One and the Many, if restricted to the realm of Becoming, leads to results which are frivolous (παιδαριώδη), facile, utterly obstructive to rational argument (14 c, d); but when the Ones are the Forms of Man, Ox, Beauty, Goodness, etc., it is then that there arises all the serious effort (ἡ πολλὴ σπουδὴ) to dispute with the help of Division whether such units really exist.

The words ἡ πολλὴ σπουδὴ μετὰ διαιρέσεως ἀμφισβήτησις γίνεταί are regarded by Professor Hackforth (*Plato's Examination of Pleasure*, p. 19 n. 2) as equivalent to τὸ πολλὰ περὶ τούτων διαιρουμένους σπουδάζειν ἀμφισβήτησις (= matter of dispute) γίνεταί. But are we to suppose that Plato, having rejected one of two alternative procedures on the score of its being frivolous, now goes on to state that the seriousness of the other, which after all is his own, is disputed or is disputable? And what will be the meaning of Protarchus' question? It ought to mean, 'How is the σπουδὴ disputable?' to which Socrates will answer, 'Whether in the first place it is necessary to suppose that some such units have real existence'. This transition is the crucial difficulty, and I know of no defence of the received text which overcomes it. Conjectures aim at making ἀμφισβήτησις the subject of γίνεταί; those, however, which do so at the expense of eliminating σπουδὴ destroy an anti-thesis frequent in Plato and fundamental to this passage, while the remainder leave an awkward collocation of substantives.

I propose ἀμφισβητήσαι; cf. *Phaedrus* 248 b οὐ δ' ἐνεχ' ἡ πολλὴ σπουδὴ τὸ ἀληθείας ἰδεῖν πεδίον. It would seem that ἀμφισβήτησις was the easy con-

struction of a scribe balked by the unfamiliar construction of the infinitive.

63 c πάντων γε μὴν ἡγοῦμεθα γενῶν ἄριστον ἓν ἀνθ' ἑνὸς συνοικεῖν ἡμῖν τὸ τοῦ γινώσκειν τὰλλὰ τε πάντα καὶ αὐτὴν αὐτῶν ἡμῶν τελῶς εἰς δύναμιν ἐκάστην. αὐτὴν TW τὴν B αὐτὴν secl. Wohlrab, Burnet, Diès.

P. W. van Heusde, *Specimen criticism in Platonem* (Leiden, 1803), p. 107: 'Scribendum videtur: καὶ αὐτὴν αὐτῶν ἡμῶν τελῶς εἰς δύναμιν ἐκάστην. Cognoscere et alia omnia et se ipsam, quoad eius fieri potest, unamquamque nostrum.' Stallbaum (ad loc., ed. 1842) in reporting this conjecture comments: 'Quod tamen videtur a mente scriptoris alienum esse, quippe qui voluptatibus sui cognitionem aliquam vix adscripserit.' On the contrary, nothing could be more appropriate. The pleasures personified are asked whether they would like to live in company with knowledge. They accept the invitation because (a) it has been shown that no genus or family can live alone (since it is not ἱκανόν, 20 d), and (b) the best of all the families to share their house is after due consideration found to be the family of knowledge, i.e. knowledge in general and above all self-knowledge as perfect as possible for each pleasure: self-knowledge because how else could they know that they were pleasures? Cf. 21 b τοῦν δέ γε καὶ μνήμην καὶ ἐπιστήμην καὶ δόξαν μὴ κεκτημένους ἀληθῆ, πρῶτον μὲν τοῦτο αὐτό, εἰ χαίρεις ἢ μὴ χαίρεις, ἀνάγκη δὴπου σε ἀγνοεῖν, κενόν γε ὄντα πάσης φρονήσεως;—ἀνάγκη. Similarly, 60 d εἰ δέ γε παρηνέχθημέν τι τότε, νῦν ὅστισοῦν ἐπαναλαβὼν ὀρθότερον εἰπάτω, μνήμην καὶ φρόνησιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην καὶ ἀληθῆ δόξαν τῆς αὐτῆς ιδέας τιθέμενος καὶ σκοπῶν εἰ τις ἀνευ τούτων δέξαιτ' ἂν οἱ καὶ ὅτιοῦν εἶναι ἢ καὶ γίνεσθαι, μὴ ὅτι δὴ γε ἡδονὴν εἶθ' ὥς πλείστην εἶθ' ὥς σφοδρότατην, ἣν μῆτε ἀληθῶς δοξάζει χαίρειν μῆτε τὸ παράπαν γινώσκει τί ποτε πέπονθε πάθος μήτ' αὐτὴν μνήμην τοῦ πάθους μὴδ' ὄντινοῦν χρόνον ἔχει.

Van Heusde's correction is favourably mentioned by Dr. R. G. Bury, and ignored by Burnet and M. Diès.

B. S. PAGE.

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne.

THE STANDARD OF ARTAXERXES II

PROFESSOR R. L. DUNBABIN has rendered a useful service by calling attention to the proper interpretation of *Anab.* i. 10. 12 (C.R. lx. 10-11). The passage interested me many years ago, and in 1909 I proposed an interpretation, which partly agrees with Professor Dunbabin's, before the Archaeological Institute of America; an abstract appeared in *Am. Journ. Arch.*, Ser. 2, xiv (1910), 71-2. Among the audience was Professor J. W. Hewitt, who asked and received permission to make use of my interpretation in an edition of *Anabasis* i-iv, which he was then preparing in conjunction with M. W. Mather. A note based upon my paper therefore appears on p. 301 of that edition (American Book Company, 1910), and its source is acknowledged in the preface, p. 6. All that is a matter of little importance, since Professor Dunbabin reports that Macmichael's edition, which I have never seen, correctly interpreted both *πέλτη* and *ἀνατεταμένον* more than seventy years ago; but it happens that my comment covered two further points which were noted neither by Macmichael nor by Dunbabin. Since they have been overlooked, I take this occasion to repeat them, with the more reason because, in the mean time, one of them has been put forward independently by another writer.

1. It is not necessary to assume that the eagle was perched on the upper edge of the *πέλτη*; the elliptical or crescent-shaped shield may have served as a background for an eagle-like device (*αἰετόν τινα*), which would fit neatly into such a form, particularly if the wings were spread—not that *ἀνατεταμένον* has that meaning, for, as Professor Dunbabin rightly insists, it is simply 'held aloft'. My suggestion goes better, perhaps, with the reading *ἐπὶ πέλτη*, which has good authority and is preferred by Masqueray. It is also possible that the rim of the *πέλτη* served as a frame for the 'eagle', while the background was cut away in order that the device might be visible from both sides.

2. Xenophon's words *αἰετόν τινα* seem to betray a doubt whether the standard actually represented an eagle. The bird was indeed a symbol of royalty among the Greeks, but there is no convincing proof that it was generally accepted as such by the Persians of the fifth and fourth centuries. Aesch. *Pers.* 205-10 cannot be taken as evidence for Persian ideas, and the material collected by Jackson from Persian literature (*J.A.O.S.* xx. 57) belongs to a much later period. It is true that the uncertainty which *τινα* seems to express in *Anab.* i. 10. 12 disappears in *Cyrop.* vii. 1. 4, *ἣν δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ σημεῖον αἰετὸς χρυσοῦς ἐπὶ δόρατος μακροῦ ἀνατεταμένους*. There, however, Xenophon is writing with the freedom of a romancer and after the lapse of some years.

The standard of Darius III which was shown in the famous mosaic of Alexander at the battle of Issus has been almost destroyed. A square frame enclosed a figure of a bird, of which only the head is left. It is thought to be a cock (F. Sarre, 'Altorient. Feldzeichen', *Beiträge zur alt. Gesch.* iii. 348), a bird which the Persians regarded as of good omen, if not actually sacred, because he was the herald of light (*S.B.E.* iv. 193; v. 73). Yet the Alexander mosaic gives us only a Greek artist's notion of the Persian royal standard. A story of doubtful value told by Plutarch (*Ariax.* 10. 3) relates that the king allowed the Carian soldier who struck Cyrus down to carry before the army a standard bearing a golden cock.¹

As far as I know, the character of the Persian standard cannot be definitely established by a search of Persian antiquities. But attention may be called to the fact that on several sculptures

¹ Clemen thinks that the king did use a cock-ensign as a sacred emblem, but rejects the story about the Carian soldier, which has an aetiological appearance (the Persians called the Carians 'cocks' because of the crests on their helmets; the Carian soldier is appropriately rewarded with the privilege of carrying a cock-standard). See *R.G.V.V.* 17. 87.

and seals¹ the winged emblem of Ahura Mazda² hovers over the head of the Great King. It is a circle, originally representing the sun-disk, from which great wings extend horizontally; in the circle there usually appears a human form ending below in the tail of a bird. Either with or without the human figure this emblem might, from a distance, be mistaken for an eagle.³

It does not seem unlikely that this

¹ For convenience I refer to the easily accessible English translation of Perrot and Chipiez's *Hist. of Art in Persia*, figs. 112, 156, 189-91, 200, 216, and the plate facing p. 218.

² Miss Taylor's opinion (*J.H.S.* xlvii. 56) that it is really the *fravashi* or *baluvar* of the king is favoured by the close resemblance between the human figure in the winged circle and the monarch over whom it appears. In general, however, the evidence indicates that the figure is the god or his *fravashi* (Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, 260).

³ Mr. A. S. F. Gow recognized this possibility (*J.H.S.* xlviii. 139), not knowing that I had previously mentioned it. His Plate IX gives some excellent illustrations of Persian seals that show the winged emblem.

symbol of the invisible god was made into an ensign to accompany and protect the person of the king; at a slightly later period it was used even to mark his property, and it appears on the coins of his satraps.⁴ The analogy of Assyrian custom may be significant. The winged symbol of the god Assur, from which the symbol of Ahura Mazda was evidently derived, appears over the heads of the Assyrian monarchs as they hunt or wage war; and a figure of Assur, enclosed in a circle (without the wings, it is true), actually appears as the device of standards fixed to the royal chariots (Sarre, *op. cit.* 340). We cannot prove that the symbol of Ahura Mazda was so used; but, now as before, I would offer that conjecture as a satisfactory explanation of Xenophon's words.

CAMPBELL BONNER.

Ann Arbor, Michigan.

⁴ E. J. Pilcher, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 1910, 93-101, 143-52.

CICERO, *AD FAM.* viii. 8. 9

IN this passage *negotium* is translated 'hitch' by W. W. How,¹ who thereby agrees with Mommsen,² Rice Holmes,³ Ferrero,⁴ Heitland,⁵ and Meyer⁶ in regarding the paragraph as a description of Pompey's hostility to Caesar. F. E. Adcock⁷ agrees with this interpretation in general, but, like Tyrell and Purser,⁸ is inconsistent in detail: if *negotium* means 'hitch', surely we must regard *quam clementer* as ironical.

When Scribonius Curio later proposed that both Pompey and Caesar lay down their arms, 370 senators approved, against only twenty-two irreconcilables;⁹ it is therefore clear that

in the spring of 50 B.C. nothing would have been less welcome to the majority than an open expression of hostility to Caesar on Pompey's part. In his letter to Cicero, however, Caelius remarks that something has happened to make people breathe more easily ('illa . . . Cn. Pompei . . . quae maxime confidentiam attulerunt hominibus'): the remarks of Pompey have made it clear *Pompeio cum Caesare esse negotium*. If *negotium* here means 'hitch', the earlier sentence is nonsense, and so is the whole surrounding context; Caelius means that 'something is going on'¹⁰ between those two': in other words, *negotium* (which, after all, is a neutral word, taking its meaning from its context) must mean 'agreement, understanding'. Since there is no evidence¹¹ that Pompey intended to cancel or ignore the 'law of the ten tribunes' of 52 B.C., and then, by invoking the *lex Pompeia de provinciis* of the same year,

¹ *Select Letters*, ii. 268; cf. p. 168.

² *History of Rome* (tr. Dickson, Everyman's Library), iv. 322.

³ *Roman Republic*, ii. 243-4.

⁴ *Grandezza e Decadenza di Roma*, ii. 242-3.

⁵ *Roman Republic*, iii. 261.

⁶ *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus*, 255.

⁷ *C.A.H.* ix. 630-1.

⁸ *Correspondence of Cicero*, iii. 116.

⁹ *App. Bell. Civ.* ii. 4. 30; How, p. 173; Adcock in *C.A.H.* ix. 635.

¹⁰ Cf., for example, Ter. *Ad.* 638, 642.

¹¹ And so Adcock, *op. cit.* 631.

to make Caesar's recall effective on 28 February instead of on the Ides of November,¹ what he meant is, in effect, this: 'If we were to begin discussing² this matter before 1 March, any objection raised by Caesar would be justifiable, as he would merely be safeguarding his legal interests; if, on the other hand, we delay discussion, as we should, until after that date, any objection on his part would be unconstitutional'; then, in answer to the impudent

¹ For this date cf. Adcock, 'The Legal Term of Caesar's Governorship in Gaul', *C.Q.* xxvi (1923), 14-26.

² How (pp. 263, 313, 315 n.) follows Hirschfeld and others in saying that it was 'clearly' illegal to begin discussion of the appointment of Caesar's successor before 1 March 50 B.C.; but see *C.A.H.* ix. 629, n. 2, and *C.Q.*, loc. cit. 21.

question, 'But what if he were to follow your own bad example? *Quid, si et consul esse et exercitum habere velit?*' he answered, without losing his temper (*quam clementer*), 'My dear sir, in the present circumstances he wouldn't do that; I should as soon expect my own son to strike me!' So, comments Caelius, people are relieved, regarding this as evidence of a willingness on Pompey's part to come to terms with Caesar; the fact that the great man's usual shuffling insincerity (or did he merely fail to realize the implications of his own words?) was later to prove deceptive is irrelevant to the interpretation of Caelius' meaning.

W. LEONARD GRANT.

University of British Columbia.

ECHOES OF AESCHINES III IN DIO CASSIUS

Blass in the *apparatus criticus* of his second edition of Aeschines (1908) had already cited one instance where Dio borrows an Aeschinean phrase (xlv. 52. 4 *πλείονας μὲν τροπὰς τρεπόμενος τοῦ πορθμοῦ πρὸς ὃν ἐφύγεν*, cf. Aeschin. iii. 90 *πλείους τραπόμενος τροπὰς τοῦ Εὐδρίπου παρ' ὃν ᾤκει*). Two more even plainer echoes are to be found on successive pages in Dio's version of Antony's funeral oration. Antony refers to the innumerable cities, previously unknown, which Caesar had conquered—ὡν οὐδὲ τὰ ὀνόματα πρότερον ᾔδειμεν (xlv. 42. 2). The phrase is quaintly borrowed from Aeschines, iii. 82—ὡν οὐδὲ τὰ ὀνόματα ᾔδειμεν πρότερον—where it had been applied sarcastically to the Thracian towns which Demosthenes is said to have invented as pretexts for war with Philip. Again, in the next chapter (43. 3) occurs *τὴν πολυτείαν μηκέτι κοινήν, ἀλλ' ἰδίαν αὐτῶν νομίζοντες εἶναι*, cf. Aeschin. iii. 3 *τὴν πολιτείαν οὐκέτι κοινήν, ἀλλ' ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἡγούμενοι*.

Both these echoes are of some interest for the text of Aeschines. At iii. 3 Dio agrees with the better manuscripts on the order of the words, implying the reading *οὐκέτι κοινήν* against the *κοινήν οὐκέτι* of the B group, accepted by Franke and Gwatkin and Shuckburgh. In iii. 82 Dio could be cited against the emendation *ᾔδειμεν* which Blass adopted in his second edition in place of the *ᾔδειμεν* of all the manuscripts. The form *ᾔδειμεν* is quoted by L. and S.⁹ from Arist. *APo.* 87^b40 and from this speech in Blass's edition of 1896. The philology of these forms of *οἶδα* has been variously explained, and, though *ᾔδειμεν* is not the earliest attested, it is well enough evidenced for the fourth century B.C. Dio adds a further argument in so far as he suggests that this was the form in his manuscripts of Aeschines. On the other hand, his order of words here shows one

striking difference. By transposing *πρότερον* in front of *ᾔδειμεν* hiatus within the colon is avoided; but since we have apparently no manuscript authority for this order in Aeschines, it is better perhaps not to impose this change on his text.

H. W. PARKE.

Trinity College, Dublin.

NOTES ON THE TOPICA OF ARISTOTLE

117^a35-6. *καὶ ὁ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἢ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις χρησιμώτερον, ὅσον δικαιοσύνη καὶ σωφροσύνη ἀνδρείας· αἱ μὲν γὰρ αἰεὶ, ἡ δὲ ποτὲ χρησίμη.*

THE subject of this section of the *Topica* is comparative predication of value-predicates, and the numerous rules given are all directed to the selection of that which is *αἰρετώτερον*.¹ In the sentence under discussion the preferability of a thing is based upon its universal or more frequent, not upon its greater, usefulness. The comparative *χρησιμώτερον* confuses the issue and should, like *χρησίμη* later in the sentence, be in the positive degree. I suggest that we should read *καὶ ὁ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἢ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις χρήσιμ(ον αἰρετ)ώτερον*, the copyist's eye having strayed forward, by a familiar kind of lipography, as he approached the end of *χρήσιμον*, and substituted for its termination that of the following adjective. For a similar idea and phrase, cf. 118^b28-30, *τὸ γὰρ πρὸς ἀπαντα ἢ πρὸς τὰ πλείω χρήσιμον αἰρετώτερον ἂν ὑπάρχοι τοῦ μὴ ὁμοίως*.

125^b4-6. *σκοπεῖν οὖν χρὴ ἐάν τις εἰς γένος θῇ τὸ τοιοῦτον εἰς τὸ μὴ τοιοῦτον.*

Pacius renders as follows, 'considerare igitur oportet an aliquis quod tale est posuerit in genere non tali'. This is the required meaning, but it

¹ See 116^a1-2 *πότερον δ' αἰρετώτερον ἢ βέλτιον δεῖν ἢ πλείονων, ἐκ τῶνδε ἀκεπτόν.*

cannot be extracted from the received text. The otiose repetition of *eis* and the use of *ἐάν* in an indirect question are alike intolerable. I conclude that *ei* has been lost by haplography before *eis*, and that we should read *ἀκονεῖν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἐάν τις εἰς γένος θῇ τὸ τοιοῦτον, <ei> eis τὸ μὴ τοιοῦτον*, 'if then someone places a term of a certain kind within a genus, you must look and see whether he has placed it within a genus which is not of that kind'.

W. S. MAGUINNESS.

Kings's College, London.

TACITUS, *AGRICOLA* 34. 2

quo modo siluas saltusque penetrantibus fortissimum quodque animal contra *ruere*, pauida et inertia ipso agminis sono *pellebantur* . . .

It seems plain that we should read *ruere* and *pellebantur*; and, further, that we should not take *ruere* as an historic infinitive (on which points see Furneaux and Anderson). But I doubt whether the meanings of the perfect and of the imperfect

have been satisfactorily explained. Anderson suggests that the perfect *ruere* 'contrasts the sudden charge with the process of retreat' in *pellebantur*; but the notion of a drawn-out retreat, which would imply a prolonged struggle, is out of place. The animals, Agricola says, were repulsed by the mere sound of the Roman advance, and the action must have been quick. It is preferable to take *pellebantur* as referring to the continuous process of withdrawal of the timid animals, which went on, whether or not the Roman soldiers saw it, all the time while they marched through the forests; and this is contrasted with the occasional charges of the wilder animals, of which Agricola's listeners themselves had full knowledge. To paraphrase the passage, 'As you have made your way through forests and woodland, the boldest animals have from time to time charged out at you—but all the while the timid and less active ones were withdrawing, frightened by the very sound of your column.'

A. C. MOORHOUSE.

University College, Swansea.

REVIEWS

DIRCAEUS CYCNUS

Gilbert NORWOOD: *Pindar* (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. XIX). Pp. 302; 2 plates. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1945. Cloth, \$2.50.

THIS is a thoroughly provocative, interesting, and even exciting book. Professor Norwood writes on Pindar for the only sufficient reason that can impel an intelligent man to produce eight lectures of literary criticism, namely that Pindar is a great poet (p. 1), and especially (p. 184) one for whom the author feels and would communicate 'an enthusiasm deep, enduring, infinitely precious'. Hence, although, after a chapter, well worth reading, on 'the approach to Pindar', two more are devoted to the poet's views on the world at large and the life of man in special, these consist largely of warnings that nothing like a philosophical system is to be looked for in the poems, a warning not unnecessary for some who have studied them with more zeal than historical sense. As a reasoner, Professor Norwood does not value Pindar highly; perhaps in this context he does not sufficiently reflect that the Theban's ethics and his outlook generally were those of an old-fashioned gentleman, who bases his

actions and judgements rather on feelings so ingrained as to have become almost instincts than on any attempt at a code which could be set forth under logical headings.

But the main interest of the book, and the subject to which by far the greater part of the space is devoted, is the literary structure of the poems, especially of course the epinicians, and the aesthetic principles which Pindar may be thought to have followed. Speaking rather more boldly than the reviewer would be inclined to do, considering how very little we know of Greek literature of the century or two before Pindar, the author commits himself to the statement that 'Pindar invented the brief ode—not merely an ode shortened by omissions . . . but an ode shortened by a new manner of handling narrative. Instead of telling the whole story in detail . . . he selected a highly significant portion and elaborated that by picturesque detail and direct moral comment, giving it structure and climax' (p. 169). This, apart from the doubtful literary history, is a sound description of the way the myth of the Fourth Pythian, for example, is told, and explains a number of allusions

(for instance, *N.* iv. 33, where a positive rule or principle, *τεθμός*, is invoked as a reason for not being too lengthy) to some understood and approved method of writing this sort of poem. So far, one may substantially agree with the lecturer. But he is on much more doubtful ground when he asks, not for the first time, what principle, if any, may be supposed to give unity to a Pindaric ode, and finds it (chapters v-vii) in what he calls symbolism. Professor Norwood holds that in most of the odes, though not in all, there is a central idea or poetic image to which the poet continually returns. This is conceived in a manner much less mechanical than the notorious 'responsions' of Mezger, for instance, but nevertheless involves some highly controversial interpretations. For example, it is a defensible proposition that the Seventh Nemean has for its key passage the 'triple diadem', as the author calls lines 77-9; it does to some extent have a triple theme (see p. 109). That the Eleventh Pythian has for its unifying idea the bee, a creature never once mentioned in it (p. 123 f.), is distinctly not so likely, nor is it rendered much more plausible by the fact that *Ἰσμήμιον* and *σμῆνος* have a certain resemblance in sound (p. 125). Much ingenuity goes to proving that the 'symbol' of the Second Olympian (p. 130 f.) is the circle or wheel, hinted at among other things by the initial letter of Theron's name, also, it seems, by the absence of any explicit mention of the *κύκλος γενέσεως* in the great eschatological passage. The Seventh Olympian is a grand poem, but that it really has a rose-tree for its basal thought (see p. 138 f.) is not a very obvious corollary, nor perhaps one which helps a reader very much to appreciate the beauties of the ode. Still, this and

other suggestions are, at worst, good fun, and the reviewer, who was thereby given an excellent excuse for re-reading much of Pindar, is not disposed to complain.

If the work reaches a second edition (and there are many books less deserving of one), the author would do well to rid it of a number of small inadequacies and errors of fact and minor interpretation. For instance (p. 29), *καλλίνικε* in Archilochos' hymn is poorly rendered by 'glorious winner', which to any one who does not know the text suggests an address to the victorious athlete, not to Herakles. There is no 'charm' in calling the smoke of a funeral pyre *λευκανθής* (p. 33; see *N.* ix. 23), for all manner of unpleasant things may 'flower' in Greek poetry, cf. e.g. Aesch. *Agam.* 1458. In *P.* iv. 2 *στᾶμεν* is not *ἐστηκέναι*, and marks the end of the ode's journey, not the manner of its performance; correct p. 36. *τλᾶν* has (see pp. 42, 59) a much wider meaning than 'find courage' or 'dare'. Are there really many who have found it 'woefully inartistic' (p. 78) that Pindar's sentences often overlap a stanza, or even a triad? The *ὄχετός* into which Augeas saw his ruined city sink (*O.* x. 37, see p. 113) is a drain, as in Arist. *Ἀθ. Πολ.* 50. 2, one of the many places where the poetical metaphor of one language is the slang of another. What are the 'dirges' of Empedokles, mentioned on p. 136? Professor Norwood (p. 153) mistakes after great names when he thinks *ἀκοντίσαιμι* in *I.* ii. 35 so inappropriate that it must be self-parody. Euripides (*H.F.* 1149) thought it a very good word for any quick ('darting') motion like that of a javelin in flight. More might be discussed, *τὰ μακρὰ δ' ἐξενέπειν ἐρύκει με τεθμός*.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE AGON IN GREEK TRAGEDY

Jacqueline DUCHEMIN: *L'Agon dans la Tragédie grecque*. Pp. 247. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1945. Paper.

THIS most painstaking study, after tracing briefly the history of the meanings of the word—'meeting', 'debate',

'contest'—notes particularly the characteristics of the judicial *ἄγων* (with its two or four set speeches, but little question and answer), the eristic or sophistic *ἄγων* (usually involving both set speeches and interrogations), and

the *ἀγών* of contrary speeches in Herodotus and Thucydides. It lays stress on a general tendency to antithesis and *ἀναλογία* in Greek thought and writing in the fifth century, and asserts the influence of this, particularly in its sophistic forms, upon tragedy—quite rightly distinguishing the *ἀγών* of comedy, with its set structure arising out of the *κῶμος*, and uninfluenced by the Sophists. All this is lucidly and satisfactorily set out.

The writer then attempts to define the word *ἀγών* as applied to tragedy, studying not only the extant but also the lost plays; and here her difficulties begin. First, *ἀγών* has no technical meaning for tragedy as it has for comedy, and after confining the word practically to scenes of the form of the controversy between Admetus and Pheres in the *Alcestis*, she finds herself in fact driven, in later chapters, into a choice between ruling out scenes which, if any, ought to be included under the title of 'tragic agon' (such as the trial scene in the *Eumenides*), or according the name (as she frequently does) to scenes which do not really conform to the definition, applying to them the title 'varieties' or some such word. The result is that the attempt (which occupies some 65 pages) to catalogue the *ἀγῶνες* of extant and lost tragedy in accordance with the definition involves much inconsistency. Moreover, the account of the plots of the lost plays and the *ἀγών* in each is frequently open to criticism. (She admits the defectiveness of the evidence.) The almost complete neglect of the considerable quantity of English work on this subject is one reason for this. Her principal authority seems to be Séchan, who is not always reliable. The only mention of an English scholar, so far as I can discover, in the whole volume, is a single passing reference to Pearson on p. 68, and it may perhaps be claimed that the light thrown on the agon as an element in tragedy by the long—only too long—discussion of it in this country is not altogether darkness.

But although the meaning of the word is somewhat fluctuating, the

writer gives good ground for the general impression (which is far from new) that there is a gradual increase in fixity of form from Aeschylus to Euripides; that the 'typical' agon, consisting of two set speeches, each followed by two (rarely three) lines from the chorus and then by a passage of stichomythia, appeared first in Sophocles, who was guided by his own instinct, that Euripides borrowed certain rhetorical characteristics from the Sophists, whose influence upon him was strong in many respects, and that the Sophists, in their turn, may have derived hints from the poets. It is, however, an exaggeration to speak of this kind of agon, as the writer sometimes does, as a 'traditional part of the drama, with fixed rules' (p. 159, etc.). If tragedy began as a choral dance, it is not likely that there was any kind of agon until the introduction of the second actor, and throughout its history its rules are very elastic; and (at least to the reviewer) the influence of 'sophistic' upon Sophocles and the originality of Euripides both appear to be underrated in these chapters.

From p. 124 onwards the work is almost purely analytic and classificatory. We have *ἀγῶνες* classified as (1) constituting the centre of the action, the issue of which depends upon the persuasion of one of the contestants; (2) connected with, but not determining the issue; (3) *ἀγῶνες hors d'œuvre*, like some academic discussions in Euripides. Or again, as *ἀγῶνες* between two or between three persons, or between two persons with a third intervening without taking part in the main discussion. The elements included in different *ἀγῶνες*, and the varieties of each element, are minutely analysed; so are the possible forms of symmetry or parallelism, and the use made of each of the several rhetorical forms as exordium, narrative, proof, and peroration. The recurrent sentiments or commonplaces used in the entire series of plays are catalogued, and the forms of *ῥήθρις* and *πᾶθος* and the various stylistic figures, and there is a detailed study of the devices employed in dialogue and parti-

cularly in stichomythia, all very laboriously set out. Readers will differ in the degree to which they find this minute analysis interesting or illuminating. The reviewer cannot help remembering that a creature (or an artistic creation)

which is too minutely dissected is usually dead at the end of the process; but, whatever its value, the task is here very faithfully performed.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

PESSIMISM IN SOPHOCLES

Johannes Cornelis OPSTELTEN: *Sophocles en het Grieksche Pessimisme*. Pp. xvi+226. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1945. Paper.

It is heartening to find a book like this published in Leyden in November 1945, in format and readability quite of pre-war standard, and in content a thesis for a doctorate of a scope which must have required long and serious study. It adds to the growing bulk of evidence that the classics have survived in a war-torn Europe.

The book is concerned with the question whether Sophocles' work is characterized by pessimism, and in particular by a specifically Greek form of pessimism, this being a subject on which many conflicting views are on record. The author answers with a qualified Yes. Sophocles was occupied with the problem of the suffering of heroic natures, and, as he did not represent suffering as the meed of sin and was not concerned like Aeschylus to illustrate the workings of divine justice, we have constantly before us the spectacle of unmerited suffering, and to this the spectacle of the heroic in man's nature forms an unequal counterweight, so that we are left with an impression of pessimism. Sophocles was no mere child of Fortune, but it may be conceded that he was *εὐκολος* to the extent that his pessimism was less of temperament than born of experience and imaginative insight; its predominant note was one of resignation. All the tones of pessimism found in Sophocles

had been heard already in Greek literature before him, but he laid special stress on two themes—the limitations of human insight and the nothingness of man in comparison with the divine powers about him; this was in part a reaction against the growing intellectualism of his day, which sought to throw off the trammels of moral and religious standards.

Dr. Opstelten is well read in all the relevant literature except what was published over here during the war, and if his views are naturally more often eclectic than original, his selection is discriminating and his criticisms are well balanced. The central theme of his book is perhaps in some ways an unsatisfactory one: 'pessimism' is too indeterminate a concept to make a good subject for close literary research. He realizes, fortunately, that neither a plunge into the deep waters of psychology nor a painstakingly detailed analysis of the plays would help to answer his question; but perhaps Greek pessimism is one of those subjects on which the most valuable things are said by the way. The best chapter is the last, in which the author, after showing the characteristic Greek—or rather Ionian—pessimism to be the result of the baffled search for *εὐδαιμονία*, reflects that the poetry of Sophocles, however 'pessimistic', does not depress, because of 'the indefinable charisma of Sophocles' art', of which 'the harmonious form no less than the pessimism had its roots in the poet's inner nature'. A. M. DALE.

THUCYDIDES

John H. FINLEY: *Thucydides*. Pp. 344. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1942. Cloth, 20s. net.

PROFESSOR FINLEY is well known to

students of Thucydides by his three articles in *Harvard Studies* (1938, 1939, and suppl. vol. i, 1940) on 'Euripides and Thucydides', 'The Origins of Thucydides' Style', and 'The Unity of

Thucydides' *History*'; he now gives us the fruit of long study and of a mature and sensible judgement. The great merits of his book are its comprehensive character and, what is even more welcome, that it asks the right questions: it states the problems clearly and faces them honestly—for instance, on the speeches:

'Of the many problems presented by the *History*, undoubtedly the most important to ourselves is whether or not it offers, especially in the speeches, a reasonably authentic picture of men's minds in the period when, purportedly at least, the speeches were delivered—or (to put the matter in another way) whether the general cast of style and thought in the speeches must be imagined as widespread in the early period of the war or, on the contrary, peculiar to Thucydides at the end of the war and thus fundamentally misleading for the earlier period. The value of the *History* will evidently be quite different depending on which of these alternatives is correct.'

Too many scholars and historians have denied all authenticity to the speeches, yet tacitly implied their truthfulness when narrating the course of events, or even stated that the value of Thucydides is not affected by the answer. In an able statement of his views, based on his earlier more detailed studies, he argues that the speeches, especially those in the first four books, faithfully reflect both the style and the arguments, i.e. the rhetoric, of the period; and it was the formative period in the development of Thucydides' own thought and methods of expression. In fact, by the end of the fifth century it had become largely outmoded.

The first three chapters deal with Thucydides' life and political background, his intellectual background, and the plan and methods of the *History*; and the next three show the application of this by an analysis of the events of the war as related by him. The last two sum up the style and the thought of Thucydides. Throughout there is good sense and clarity in the discussion; particularly admirable is Finley's sense of the unity of the whole, the close interconnexion of thought and style in all the eight books. Yet it is in discussing the particular problem of the unity of the *History*, and here alone,

that, in my opinion, Finley tends both to strain the evidence in the manner of those who maintain a thesis, and to ignore indications of different dates of composition; this, however, is a criticism rather of his article in *Athenian Studies* than of this book, in which, rightly for his purpose, he assumes the unity: 'with these words (i. 1. 1-2) Thucydides, some time after 404 B.C. . . . began his famous *History*', is his opening sentence. This, however, is a small point in a work of much understanding, one in which there are many flashes of insight—for example: 'however individually prone to abstraction Thucydides may have been or may have come to be through his long exile, such a capacity for abstraction is the very hallmark of the period'; in which, moreover, there is a fine appreciation of the central theme of the *History*, the defeat of the city which had all the material and intellectual advantages in the struggle, and all the moral advantages but one, political *σωφροσύνη*.

There are some major questions in which I think Finley's interpretation fails. i. 22. 4 and similar passages are not sufficient evidence that Thucydides held the mechanistic (or 'almost mechanistic') view of human behaviour and a cyclical view of history; all he says is that we may expect from our knowledge of human nature that similar events may occur in the future, and he was obviously right. Finley himself mentions some instances without any reference to Thucydides' view (including a most remarkable letter of Lincoln, about *σράους*, who it appears had no knowledge of Thucydides). Nor do I believe, in consequence, that he thought human conduct predictable, except so far as we all believe it, and that therefore he laid most stress on the prognostic value of his work and its 'practical' value for statesmen; one of his greatest gifts, which Finley well explains, is his power to generalize on human conduct, but just as clearly he has stressed the unpredictability of future events (i. 84. 3, etc.). Thirdly, Finley says in the last chapter, 'he applied to historiography almost the identical methods of in-

ductive reasoning that . . . Socrates applied to philosophy'; yet earlier in the book he has frequently contrasted the methods of Thucydides, and of the Sophists, with those of science, as though inductive reasoning were peculiar to the mathematical and physical sciences, and also as though the methods of the Sophists and of Socrates were identical. Lastly, he interprets ii. 55. 10-12 as meaning that the defeat of Athens was primarily due to *στάσις* of the same kind as had occurred in Corcyra and elsewhere, and that iii. 82-3 has Athens primarily in view. I think this wrong: what Thucydides has principally in mind is not a fatal division between the few and the masses after Pericles' death, but the absence of any one single leader who could guide the city in a consistent policy; neither Cleon nor Nicias, nor later Alcibiades was strong enough, as Pericles had been, to dominate the assembly for years; faction and personal rivalries were the result, and this helped the occurrence of *στάσις* in 411 and 405, but even then not *στάσις* of the intensity and savagery of that in Corcyra. Certainly if Thucydides was at work after the reconciliation of 403, he could hardly have written iii. 82-3 with Athens chiefly in mind. This conception dominates the second half of Finley's book. Hence he can say that Thucydides thought the desire of the masses for good employment and pay was the principal motive for the Sicilian expedition; but Thucydides says all

Athens but a small and timid minority was eager for it; it recalls the days of Eurymedon and Egypt, of Cimon and Pericles. It is the tragedy of Athens that Cleon and Alcibiades, not Nicias (whom Finley regards as the Periclean moderate), were the successors of Pericles.

It is disturbing in so good a book to find mistakes such as the following: the tradition 'that Harmodius and Aristogeiton killed Hippias rather than Hipparchus'; the Athenians in 432 addressed 'the Peloponnesian League'; the Athenians (at Sybota) participated 'merely to guard the harbor'; 'sober prudence (*σωφροσύνη* *ἐμφρων*)' and 'courageous and discreet' for *πολεμικοὶ καὶ εὐβουλοὶ* (i. 84. 2-3); 'Phormio surrounded the forty-seven Peloponnesian transports' (they were fighting-vessels, even though the enemy were *στρατιωτικώτερον παρεσκευασμένοι*); 'the masses' as a translation of *τῶν πολλῶν*, iii. 82. 2 and 7, where it clearly means 'the majority of men', including the rich; Cleon responsible for the Delian campaign (Thucydides does not mention him in connexion with it). All this suggests a certain carelessness in the study of his author; yet by and large carelessness is the last charge that should be made against Finley.

His book is, in fact, both thorough and illuminating; it will stimulate all students of Thucydides. But it would require a full-length essay to discuss it properly.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

PLATO'S METAPHORS

Pierre LOUIS: *Les Métaphores de Platon*. Pp. xxii + 269. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1945. Paper, 250 fr.

THIS volume is a valuable contribution to the study of Plato's writings as literature, and can hardly fail to throw light at certain points on his thought. As the author remarks, this particular field has been little explored; G. Berg's *Metaphor and Comparison in the Dialogues of Plato* (1903) seems to have been the only specialized treatise hitherto. In his introductory chapter Dr. Louis

gives a general review of his subject and indicates the scope of his inquiry. He rightly distinguishes between genuine metaphor (under which he includes 'comparison' or simile) and the use of illustrative examples in argument; these latter he sets aside, and also proverbial expressions as such. He remarks that the majority of Plato's metaphors are derived from the field of human life and activities, and suggests that this is a matter of deliberate choice; Plato was not uninterested in the world

of nature (from which he does draw some striking and important figures), but believed that human analogues would more readily appeal to readers in his day. The author points out that most of Plato's metaphors can be paralleled elsewhere in Greek literature. He does not appear to have gone into the problem of the difference between such possibly 'dead' metaphors as σκοπεῖν (e.g.) or μέθοδος and really vital and conscious imagery.

In the main body of the work Dr. Louis adopts a new and interesting method. Instead of concentrating on the domain from which metaphors are taken (an appendix does full justice to this matter), he deals rather with the ideas and topics for which metaphorical expression or analogy is found by Plato, surveying the various figures applied to the processes of thought (from the ubiquitous σκοπεῖν to more striking instances), to argument, to human life, the soul, morality and social relationships, and so on. The author's classification of topics is thorough, and his list of examples seems well-nigh exhaustive. He has ransacked the whole Platonic corpus, and an index of the passages quoted adds to the usefulness of the book. His method in exposition is to cite outstanding

examples and to refer to the rest in footnotes.

It is in this new line of approach, and in the suggestion which it may hold for the study of Plato's thought, that the value of this admirable work chiefly lies. Dr. Louis seems inclined to regard Plato's use of metaphor as a matter always of conscious intellectual choice, rather than as the outcome of any intuitive experience. This is perhaps a debatable point; in any case it is one that calls for further consideration. But it seems obvious that the figures which Plato adopts, whether by selection or from instinct, must go far to indicate the main lines and the dominant colours of his thought. Thus (e.g.) the constant recurrence in the *Republic* of the metaphor of light for knowledge, and the repeated use of the imagery of marriage, seem to point inevitably to a strain of mysticism, while the figures of ascent and of 'conversion' applied to education emphasize his preoccupation with morals. Whether we concentrate on such lines of exploration, or merely range at random over the ποικιλία of Plato's style, the subject is ready for further work, and Dr. Louis has led the way with valuable material and guidance.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

PLATO

Alexandre KOYRÉ: *Discovering Plato*. Translated by L. C. Rosenfield. Pp. ix+119. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Cloth, 10s. net.

PUBLISHERS must advertise their wares, and we must acquiesce in 'blurbs' on dust-covers; but advertisement by way of a 'Foreword', not from the author's pen, is unnecessary and undesirable in a work of scholarship at least, unless it be posthumous. The reader resents, or ought to resent, being bidden to admire. If I find Professor Koyré's book difficult to review, it is partly because I read this foreword first, and was irritated by it: I am conscious of an unfavourable bias, of which I cannot wholly rid myself.

The book's title raises a doubt which is not fully resolved by the reading of it. Are we being told how students of Plato may discover his meaning or message for themselves, or is the author himself a discoverer, in the sense that he offers an interpretation which has escaped students for twenty-three centuries? The latter alternative, thus crudely put, is perhaps an unfair suggestion: yet the first half of the book ('The Dialogue') does seem to claim that the 'Socratic dialogues' (which for M. Koyré means, somewhat surprisingly, those down to and including *Theaetetus*) ought to be read in a new way, and that this is highly important. We must, it is insisted, be 'reader-auditors': and the inconclusiveness, or ostensible incon-

clusiveness, of many of these dialogues will then somehow explain itself. To be a reader-auditor apparently means to make allowances for the shortcomings of Socrates' interlocutors; but, on the one hand, these shortcomings usually (e.g. in the characters of Euthyphro, Polus, Meno) hit the mere reader, who is not consciously an auditor, in the eye: and, on the other, M. Koyré seems to make them responsible for too much. What we are, in effect, asked to believe all through this first part is that Plato, while having in his own mind a complete solution to all the problems raised, has chosen to conceal it from his readers in order to evoke a personal effort of understanding on their part: and that the means adopted to this end is to make Socrates' interlocutors either stupid (like Meno and Euthyphro) or 'too young' (like Theaetetus). That there is some truth in this view need not be denied: but I think it is far from being the whole truth, and it improperly ignores the possibility that Plato himself in his early works is puzzling over problems which he has not yet fully solved. With the estimate of Theaetetus on pp. 47-8 I disagree almost entirely.

A large part of the book consists of summaries, or partial summaries, of dialogues, in spite of the author's repeated assurance that he will not summarize. With the method he has chosen, summary was unavoidable: and on the whole it is well done, and the interspersed comments are mostly sound and sensible, if not particularly novel. But a method which entails adding yet another outline of the *Republic* (with which the second part is almost exclusively concerned) to the numerous ex-

cellent accounts of that work already in existence, and mostly quite accessible, is to be regretted; moreover, the comment in this part, and the concluding remarks on the relevance of its lessons to the present day, are hardly striking enough to reward the reader for his pains.

That a book on Plato should confine itself to certain dialogues and certain aspects of his philosophy is quite legitimate, provided that it is clearly and prominently stated that this is being done. But M. Koyré does not fulfil this condition. Can anyone hope to 'discover' Plato if he is told nothing, or next to nothing, about Plato's discussions of Eros, of the soul's immortality, of the great myths, of the logical and ontological problems of the *Sophist*, and the cosmogony of the *Timaeus*? Incidentally, the author's imperfect acquaintance with the facts of Plato's life is apparent from the words 'Dion on the throne' (p. 70), which cannot but imply, in their context, that Plato aimed, on his second or third visit to Syracuse, at displacing Dionysius in favour of Dion.

The American translation, so far as I can gauge, is adequate save for words like 'benefactory', 'effectuate', and 'negativistic'; but is the poverty of our *patrius sermo* such that a certain conception 'might for lack of a better term be called "organicistic"?'

Lastly, why not make it easier for the reader to check the longer quotations, at least, by giving the page of the dialogue quoted? On the whole, the book, despite its author's enthusiasm and occasional insight, is disappointing.

R. HACKFORTH.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

THE LOEB DIONYSIUS

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*. With an English translation by Earnest CARY, Ph.D., on the basis of the version of Edward Spelman. Vol. V, Books VIII-IX.24 (Loeb Classical Library). London: Heinemann, 1945. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

DR. CARY continues his task of editing

Dionysius on the basis of Jacoby's text and Spelman's translation with the same care and good taste as before. His independence is marked by many departures from Jacoby's text, where he supports the manuscripts or other scholars' emendations (noteworthy cases are MS. $\mu\eta$ τυχόντι at viii. 26. 1, MS. οὐκ for heavy sarcasm at viii. 32. 5, MS.

εἶναι without a negative at viii. 73. 3, Kiessling's φιλονεικοῦντι at viii. 25. 3, and Naber's κελύη at ix. 1. 4) or where he contributes corrections of his own, e.g. ἐκπέμπειν ἕως ἂν (viii. 15. 2: combining Kiessling and Jacoby), ἀνθρώπων (viii. 20. 3; MS. ἀλόντων), χωσθέντι (viii. 59. 4), πολλοῖς (ix. 8. 2), ἐπιτιθεμένων (ix. 15. 7); with less cause ἂν (viii. 25. 2), and ὁμολογούντων (viii. 68. 3).

These and other readings show Cary's readiness to emend for the sake of good sense; yet often he hesitates where the need appears at least equally great. Why restore MS. προελθών for Sylburg's παρελθών at viii. 58. 4, or MS. γραφέν for Cobet's γράφειν at viii. 74. 4? At viii. 73. 3 he adds Cobet's δέκα, and at viii. 75. 2 accepts Post's brilliant ἀποργασθεῖεν into the text; yet at viii. 56. 1, although in a note he recognizes the need to add a verb in the subjunctive, unless we are to assume anacoluthon (which in that sentence is unlikely), and cites three attractive suggestions, he does nothing about it.

Particularly uncertain is the treatment of suspected glosses. Cary admits the presence of glosses, e.g. at viii. 21. 2, 32. 3, 50. 3, 67. 5, 69. 1; yet in other places he retains suspicious phrases bracketed by Jacoby, e.g. viii. 6. 2, 17. 1, 24. 6, 29. 2, 49. 6, and sometimes reads in the text phrases he discounts in the notes, e.g. viii. 53. 3, ix. 9. 8 (cf. viii. 49. 6, ix. 11. 5), without indicating why he has suddenly become so conservative.

The main interest of this edition for the reviewer lies in Cary's attempts to provide new remedies for notorious old cruxes. The General Editors have given useful help here. Capps has neat emendations accepted at viii. 50. 2, 51. 4 (καταβαλεῖν for MS. καταλιπεῖν), 73. 1; Post at viii. 73. 5, 75. 2, ix. 3. 5; Cary notes but does not accept Post's interesting conjectures αὐ τοῖς θεοῖς for MS. αὐτοῖς at viii. 56. 1 and δεινόν for MS. κοινόν at viii. 91. 3.

At viii. 19. 4 the manuscripts A and B give κοπιολανῶν, which could be a corruption of Κοριολανῶν, 'of the Coriolani'; and the late manuscripts give Κοριολανῶν, which could be a scribe's con-

jecture; at viii. 36. 2 the manuscripts agree on χωριελανούς, which could be a corruption of Κοριολανούς. The references, however, are to different cities, of which one, not both, can be Corioli. Cary reads Κοριολανῶν in 19. 4 and leaves Χωριελανούς in the air. The slight advantage in palaeographical probability can be ignored, when either passage could reasonably be referred to Corioli, and Cary might have done better either to leave the choice open, as Jacoby does, by reading Κοπιολανῶν at 19. 4, or to take Χωριελανούς in 36. 2 as the reference to Corioli, as most historians do, arguing (for what it is worth) from the association of names in Livy ii. 39. 3, and to consider more seriously Niebuhr's Καρυντανῶν at 19. 4. Ἀλβίητας at 36. 2 may be a corruption of Λαβινιάτας, *Lavinienenses*, unless it refers to the otherwise unknown *Albenses* of Pliny, *N.H.* iii. 69. Cary welcomes Λαβινιάτας as an emendation but does not receive it into the text.

viii. 55. 2: ἡ βουλή περὶ μὲν τοῦ Μαρκίου γνώμην ἀπεδείξαντο . . . ἀναβάλλεσθαι . . . ταῖς δὲ γυναῖξιν ἔπαιον τε ἀποδεδόσθαι τῆς προθυμίας ἔνεκα (Cary; πάλαι MSS.) δημοσίᾳ γραφῇ μνήμην οἶσοντα ἐκ τῶν ἐπιγινόμενων αἰώνιον, καὶ γέρας κτλ. The point here is clear: the Senate decreed that the women should be granted formal ἔπαιος and a γέρας. Should we not therefore begin by reading ἀποδιδόσθαι for ἀποδεδόσθαι (cf. ἀναβάλλεσθαι just above) with Garrer (whom Cary does not cite from Jacoby's *apparatus criticus*)? πάλαι makes no sense in this context, but ἔνεκα, based on the construction of laudatory decrees, is scarcely necessary; Cary suggests also αὐτίκα. A better remedy might be to read πάλιν (with Sintenis) for πάλαι: the women should receive praise *again*, that is, repeating the praise they had already received in the celebrations on their return, only this time by public inscription (δημοσίᾳ γραφῇ), which should ensure that they would win eternal remembrance on the part of future generations.

ix. 24. 2 contains a crux in the description of Rome at bay after the battle of Cremera: πυρσοί τε συνεχεῖς,

οἷα δὲ ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ σκότῳ, διὰ τε ὑπολαμπάδων (Post; δίατρά τε (δίατράτε) ὑπὸ λαμπάδων MSS.) καὶ ἀπὸ τεγῶν τοσοῦτοι τὸ πλήθος ἤθοντο (Capps; ἤροντο B) ὥστε κτλ.: 'and an uninterrupted succession of torches, as it was in the night and dark, blazed through lanterns and from roofs, so many in number that,' etc. The 'lanterns' (Cary explains in a note) are the light open structures set upon a roof to admit light and air to the interior (cf. *I.G.* xi. 366 A, ll. 14-48). This is probably the best correction for

an obscure passage—but perhaps old Spelman should get some credit, too: 'the fires they made were so close to one another, it being in the night, and dark, and such a number of torches were lighted in the rooms, and on the top of the houses, that,' etc. Cary, Capps, and Post have carried over Spelman's common sense into the text in a combined piece of scholarship that pleasantly illustrates the merits of this Loeb edition. A. H. McDONALD.

University of Sydney.

GREEK NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES

Carl Darling BUCK and Walter PETERSEN: *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* arranged by terminations with brief historical introductions. Pp. xvii+765. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1945. Cloth, £3 net.

THIS important compilation of over 100,000 Greek nouns and adjectives is designed as well for editors restoring lacunae in inscriptions and papyri as for students of the history of the language. Within its scope, it supersedes the *Heidelberger Konträrindex der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* and also for the first time gives an exhaustive collection of material for the study of Greek noun and adjective formation. The double purpose of the work has dictated a compromise between simple reverse alphabetical order and philological classification. The words are placed in about 100 groups under the main headings of vowel (and diphthongal) stems, and nasal, liquid, labial, dental, guttural, and palatal terminations, in reverse alphabetical order within each group. But groups of more than two compounds are printed together, with obvious advantages, even at the cost of slight disturbances of alphabetic order. First and Second Declension stems in *ο* and *α*, amounting to about two-thirds of the whole contents, are distributed according to the letter preceding *ο* or *α*, in some forty groups associated with the above categories. Perhaps the epigraphist will grudge the philologist this concession,

but some such classification was desirable, and there is often an affinity between these forms and the groups with which they are associated. But distinctions in formation are not strictly observed in any group: thus, words in *-μος* appear together whether *μ* belongs to the root, as in *δρόμος*, or to a suffix, as in *θερμός*. This is obviously convenient for epigraphists, and it sometimes illustrates a common type of illogical development in language. In the treatment of dialect variants a reasonable compromise has been made; but the *ā/η* variation, unless it may be assumed, as in the ending of such nouns as *δίκη*, is almost fully recorded, even to the inclusion of *τατωμένα· στερομένη* (Hesych.). As to this last, the present work does not include verbs, but verbal forms in *-τεος* and *-τεον* are admitted, with a few participial forms in *-μενος* 'which are isolated in either form or use'.

The foundations of this work were laid in the collections of Dr. A. W. Stratton, from which separate studies on several types were published by himself and, after he died in 1902, by others, including the present editors, in various periodicals and monographs. From 1930 to 1935 the Rockefeller Foundation, by enabling Professor Petersen's full services to be engaged, and in other ways, made possible the exhaustive collection and unified publication of the whole material in this field. Apart from proper names, the bulk of which are necessarily omitted, these collections

now cover the literature, inscriptions, papyri, commentators, grammarians, and lexicographers down to the Byzantine age (except as to later Byzantine colloquialisms and extravagant compounds). The editors were perhaps right in liberally admitting words from Hesychius, even corruptions that will not be elucidated until the new edition of Hesychius appears. But in general, wherever the evidence could be scrutinized, the editors have taken immense pains to eliminate fictitious entries current in the older dictionaries. For inscriptions and papyri the material is drawn not only from the indexes of published collections and, as to papyri, from Preisigke's *Wörterbuch*, but also from a vast number of periodicals and other sources, in which the editors do not claim to have overlooked nothing. The historical surveys by Professor

Petersen outlining the linguistic development of the several formations are of the greatest value. For the most part they are short, up-to-date summaries of the literature on each point. Professor Petersen had also undertaken (for separate publication) a comprehensive series of such historical studies, the completion of which his death in 1939 most unfortunately forestalled.

Doubtless, as the preface suggests, specialists will find some errors and omissions, and a few trivial inconsistencies surviving from the early stages of the work. But the wide scope of the present compilation and the obvious skill and care with which the collection, revision, and arrangement of the material have been planned and executed leave no doubts of its merits as a whole.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

ABLATIVE AND GENITIVE OF QUALITY

Eirik VANDVIK: *Genetivus und Ablativus Qualitatis*. Pp. 115. Oslo: Dybwad, 1942. Paper, kr. 7.

THIS scholarly investigation of the origins, history, and interrelation of these two constructions acknowledges a debt to the work of G. V. Edwards on the same subject (New York, 1900), but is far more enlightening and conclusive. The semasiological method adopted may owe something to suggestions in B. Raabe's short dissertation *de Genetivo Latino capita tria* (Königsberg, 1917), which, however, merely touches the fringe of the subject.

Attention is called to semantic change of value in the various genitive expressions which are usually classed together as Genitives of Quality. V. would restrict this term to genitive expressions in which the noun denotes a real quality or characteristic (*vir maximi animi*, *summae audaciae*, etc.), and would exclude those in which the noun denotes something external which, with its epithet, serves as a means of classifying (*res eius modi*, *magni periculi res*, *multi cibi hospes*, *magni sunt oneris*, *puer decem annorum*). The latter types are the earlier, and of the former there are

only two examples in early Latin. But these classifying expressions, in most of which the possessive idea of 'belonging to a class' is fairly clear, were capable of developing a secondary qualitative sense (e.g. *magni oneris* suggests 'patience', 'endurance'; *multi cibi* suggests 'greediness', etc.). This led to the extension of the construction to nouns denoting internal characteristics and to epithets other than demonstrative or quantitative (*homo animi perditii*), in which expressions the possessive idea is no longer clear. The bridge between the nouns denoting external things and those denoting internal characteristics is further strengthened by an appeal to the primitive habit of personification. Just as this enabled an external abstract quality to be expressed as an accompaniment by the ablative (*femina eximia forma*), so an internal quality, such as courage, virtue, vice, when personified into a principle which pervaded, possessed, or governed a person or thing, was naturally expressed by the genitive.

V. thus agrees with Edwards and Wölfflin in deriving the Genitive of Quality from the idea of possession, and follows the generally accepted deriva-

tion of the Ablative of Quality from the Sociative-Instrumental. But he differs from them in his conclusions about the difference in the underlying sense of the two constructions. It is not that the ablative expresses temporary and the genitive permanent characteristics, but that the ablative originally expressed external, and the genitive internal qualities. The ablative was the normal method of expressing permanent as well as temporary external characteristics from Plautus to Cicero, while the use of the genitive to express external characteristics is poetic and post-Augustan, i.e. *cervus vasti corporis* is not classical. On the other hand, the extension of the ablative to express internal qualities had already taken place in the time of Plautus. This was due to two main causes: (1) The adverbial origin of the Ablative of Quality caused it to be preferred whenever the quality was predicated, even when the quality was internal. In Cicero 66 per cent. of the Ablatives of Quality are predicative. (2) Authors up to Cicero had some objection to genitives of the third, fourth, and fifth declensions in this construction, and so used the ablatives of them even of internal qualities and adnominally. There is not enough difference between the appearance of a quality, viewed as an accompaniment, and its actual existence apart from appearances, to prevent the use of the ablative to express internal and essential qualities, whenever stylistic or other reasons favoured it.

The above conclusions are founded on a searching examination of the existing evidence from Plautus to Tacitus, and are, in the main, convincing. Pp. 60-1 contain a useful summing up of the usage of the two main periods of

Latin literature. Authors are divided into two groups: (1), the early dramatic poets, Cicero, Caesar, Nepos, and Sallust; (2), Cicero's correspondents, the 'Caesarian' authors of *B.G.* viii, *Bellum Alex.*, *Hispan.*, and *Afric.*, Livy, and the authors of the Silver Age. Tacitus, with a finer linguistic sense than other authors of his age, shows a tendency to return to classical usage, and occupies a position midway between the two groups. The authors of the first group, particularly Cicero and Caesar, were keenly alive to the distinctions between the two constructions, which are indicated above. In them apparent disregard of the inner sense can be traced to observable reasons, semantic or stylistic. But their reasons were not appreciated by the authors who followed them. These began to prefer the genitive for both external and internal qualities, both predicatively and adnominally; genitives of the third and fourth declensions were no longer banned, etc., and from Livy onwards the distinction in sense between the ablative and genitive in these expressions was clearly no longer felt. The book ends with useful observations on the usage of particular authors.

It is probable that the findings of this investigation, as often happens, are too complicated to be fully expounded in text-books intended for schools and colleges, but present methods of exposition must be modified in the light of them. The book should be made available in all university libraries, for it is a good contribution to the study of historical syntax and is well up to the high standard which we have learned to expect from Scandinavian scholars.

E. C. WOODCOCK.

University of Manchester.

HYACINTHUS

Machteld J. MELLINK: *Hyakinthos*. Pp. 184. Utrecht: Kemink en Zoon, 1943. Paper.

To write on *Hyakinthos* acceptably it is indeed necessary to have considerable learning, for the relevant facts are many and heterogeneous. It is even better to

have good sense, for theories abound and are not always of the soundest. The present author has both in good measure, hence this monograph is of real worth; its faulty English is explained by the date, and it is to be hoped that now, with something like normal com-

munications resumed with Holland, those Dutch scholars who do us the compliment of using our tongue may find help ungrudgingly given them by its native speakers when our puzzling idioms trouble them.

That Hyakinthos is an old, pre-Hellenic god whose cult has been overlaid by Apollo's no one doubts. The central question, on which depend the answers to several curious problems connected with Greek cult and the history of the Peloponnesos in early Dorian days, is how far and how deep the supersession went. Hitherto it has been customary, in analysing the ritual of the Hyakinthia, of which we are tolerably well informed, to assume rather too readily that its gloomy part belonged to the dead vegetation-deity, its brighter side to the Olympian, who does not die. Miss Mellink points out that this over-simplifies. Hyakinthos no doubt died; but by all analogy and some direct evidence, he rose again, and joy over his return is a perfectly understandable element in his rites. The equation 'joyous ritual = Apolline ritual' is not therefore to be accepted without examination.

Connected with all this is the ques-

tion who introduced Apollo, and when. Miss Mellink shows that we cannot simply assume it was the Dorians. The tough pre-Dorian population of Amyklai, Achaians or whatever we like to style them, may themselves have modified their traditional ritual. If Hyakinthos was a year-god, Eniautos Daimon, or whatever name is preferred, of Cretan type, as seems very likely, one of his forms could easily be assimilated to Apollo, that in which the 'year-baby' has grown into a vigorous young hunter. Even the famous pillar-idol and the throne on which it rather inconsistently stood have parallels which owe nothing to any Dorian, and both may be very early.

It will be seen that Miss Mellink, while critical of the hypotheses of others, is capable of fairly bold speculation on her own account. But it is never wild, and her views certainly must be considered by future historians, whether of Peloponnesian religion or of the relevant periods of Peloponnesian history. Of actual mistakes in matters of fact I have found none of the smallest importance.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

PROMETHEUS AND HELEN

Karl KERÉNYI: (1) *Prometheus*. Das griechische Mythologem von der menschlichen Existenz. Pp. 82. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1946. Paper, 6 Sw. fr.

(2) *Die Geburt der Helena*. Samt humanistischen Schriften aus den Jahren 1943-45. Pp. 139. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1945. Paper, 8 Sw. fr.

THE former of these works is an unprepossessing example of the ingenious author's methods, of which I have briefly spoken elsewhere in this journal.¹ Here, it seems to me, his imagination has run away with him, and some of his reasonings smack of dead theories better forgotten. Prometheus, to him, is a lunar figure, apparently (p. 22 f.) because his liver, preyed upon by the

eagle, waxes and wanes like the moon, and the dark colour of the liver suggests the dark of the moon. Hesychios, in a very obscure gloss, says: 'Ἰθάς, ὁ τῶν Τυτῆων κῆρυξ Προμηθεύς, τινὲς Ἰθαξ, leaving us completely in the dark as to who used this mysterious name, whether he was in jest or earnest, and whether it was this unknown author or some commentator who identified Ithas-Ithax with Prometheus. Kerényi (p. 32 f.) seizes on the resemblance of the name to Ἰθάκη, Ἰθακήσιος, and deduces at least a similarity between Prometheus and Odysseus, and therefore an association with Hermes, because in art he and Odysseus often wear a similar kind of cap. Apart from this and some remarks about the Aeschylean Prometheus-dramas which are neither very new nor very convincing, we are given abun-

¹ See C.R. lx. 93.

dance of vague writing, of a metaphysical tone, concerning the 'bipolarity' of human and divine in Greek thought and the relation of Prometheus to the former. All this is singularly alien to the figure of the Trickster-hero from whose doings most of the mythology of Prometheus springs, and has not much to do with the old god of fire and the artisans who use it whom he somehow and somewhere absorbed.

The other work is a collection of unpublished articles and essays of various length and of dates from 1939 to 1945. Nearly all (No. VII, *Selbstbekenntnisse des Livius*, is an exception) deal either with specifically Greek themes or with problems of culture and of philology in general. The essay on Helen, which gives the book its title, comes by rather devious ways to the conclusion that the ancients' conception of the choice confronting a beautiful woman was 'ent-

weder Nemesis oder Aphrodite. . . . Entweder die Tochter der Nemesis bleiben und aus der Quelle des Sündenbewusstseins sich zur Strafe der Menschheit erheben . . . oder . . . bei der schweren, gleichgültigen Herrin dienen und den reinen, schuldlosen Glanz der Aphrodite tragen.' I am not convinced. No. III (pp. 42-78), perhaps the most important single item, deals with the mysteries of the Kabeiroi and with ancient mysteries in general. The facts are interestingly presented; but it may be questioned whether the interpretations do not savour too much of modern European fancies, from Goethe to the present day. The other pieces are slighter, but one or two of them contain timely and eloquent defences of humanism against the barbarism whereof Nazi Germany was the worst but not the only exponent. H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

ATTIC POTTERS

J. D. BEAZLEY: *Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens*. Pp. 43; 8 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1945. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.

THE joint meeting of Classical Societies at Oxford in September 1942 shines in the memory particularly of those who managed brief escapes from war jobs to attend it, and no evidence of the survival of civilization was more welcome than Professor Beazley's paper, which he here publishes in a revised and expanded form. The fantastic achievement of *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* and of the still unpublished *Attic Black-figure Vase-painters* is here made the foundation for new building: 'now that the *painters* of nearly all important Attic vases, and most of the less important, have been determined, the whole material must be re-studied from the point of view of the *potters*.' Important pioneer work, to which Professor Beazley pays ample tribute, has been done by the Swiss scholar Bloesch in *Formen attischer Schalen*. The following remarks are not in any sense criticisms but merely reflections prompted by reading this enchanting

lecture. It starts with a discussion of the representations of Attic potters on vases and comes to the interesting conclusion 'that the same establishment sometimes produced both vases with figurework and coarser household ware'; I have often wondered whether fine pottery was sometimes, as nowadays, carried by a tile factory—possible clues may exist in the similarity of patterns on tiles and vases and in the occasional occurrence of love-names on tiles. One vase not discussed is the Theseus painter's skyphos (C.V.A., *Baltimore*, fasc. 3, pl. i); the men under the handles appear to be decorating (?) amphorae and the main scene may be the erection of a kiln (cf. Beazley, *J.H.S.*, 1939, 153, and contrast Greifenhagen, *Ph.W.*, 1939, 1056). The Euergides painter's cup in the Acropolis collection (pl. i. 2-3) appears to show a vase-painter in the middle of a metal-worker's shop; but is he possibly inscribing a design on a rotated bronze cup and hence his presence and the curious shape of the cup?

Professor Beazley then proceeds to discuss the inscriptions from potter dedications on the Acropolis. The scale

of these dedications, a bronze statue, a kore of Antenor, a relief by Endoios, show the potters to have been men of some substance and confirm Professor Beazley's interpretation of the scanty evidence on vases for their private lives (pp. 11, 19). But the links are apparently missing to construct an equation between these dedications, which are described as a 'tithe' (of what?) and are of estimable cost, and the prices of vases at that time (cf. Amyx, *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, i. 179). If such an equation could be constructed, it would throw a great deal of light on the scale of the pottery industry in the ripe archaic period.

Professor Beazley then turns to the signatures on vases and now believes that 'in general' ἐποίησεν means 'fashioned the vase with his own hands', although the word ποιεῖν may come to

mean 'produced at my direction, under my eye, perhaps to my design, at least in my way, by my will'. He discusses instances of division of labour between two potters and two painters, the relation of ripe archaic cup-painters to their potters as mapped out by Bloesch, and various other problems.

He says finally, when stressing the need for re-studying the material from the point of view of the potters: 'it will not be enough to note the general proportions, and the features of the shape: the eye must become accustomed to perceive minute refinements of curve and line.' This is obviously right, but carries with it the further point that entirely new standards of photography will have to be introduced and observed in publications and accurate line-drawings will be needed of all vases.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

SPARTA

François OLLIER: *Le Mirage spartiate*.

II^e Partie. Étude sur l'idéalisation de Sparte dans l'antiquité grecque du début de l'école cynique jusqu'à la fin de la cité. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, Troisième Série, Lettres, Fascicule 13.) Pp. 220. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1943. Paper.

In his preface M. Ollier expresses the hope that he has used all evidence which is capable of being used, and the regret that his results will seem rather scanty. This is indeed a fair summary of the book. Much credit should be given to the author for the exhaustive scope of his research into the literary evidence, though not the archaeological (a defect common to vol. i; cf. *C.R.* xlix, p. 184), and for the grace and clarity with which his views are expounded: but the results remain disappointing. This is due partly to the subject; for M. Ollier sets out not to examine the real conditions at Sparta in the Hellenistic and Roman periods but to measure the gulf of illusion which separates the views of contemporaries about Sparta from the realities of Spartan life and manners. The evidence is, however, insufficient

to establish a sure footing on either side of the gulf, and the reader is apt to find himself in mid-air.

The first two chapters, dealing with the Cynics' view of Sparta and with the Spartan apophthegms, afford a good example of this. The general conclusion is acceptable, namely that the fourth century saw an increase in the idealization of Sparta by philosophers and an increase in the coining of Spartan apophthegms. But much of the detailed evidence is too flimsy to carry the deductions which M. Ollier makes. For instance, even if we are prepared to concede that the apophthegm 'I leave the gentlemen to join the ladies' is an authentic utterance by Diogenes leaving Sparta for Athens and also in the reverse form by Antisthenes leaving Athens for Sparta, it is rash to deduce from this that the Cynics admired and idealized the ethics of fourth-century Sparta. And when similar *bons mots* are ascribed both to Cynics and to Spartans it is safer to consider them fictitious witticisms than evidence of the Cynics' admiration for Sparta.

In his third chapter M. Ollier con-

siders the fragments of Dicaearchus, whose *Τριπολιτικός* he considers to have canonized the view that the Spartan constitution was the leading example of the mixed constitution, and of Ephorus and Theopompus, in both of whom he finds some idealization of Sparta. In particular he argues that the legend of Lycurgus was canonized by Ephorus, whose work influenced Aristotle, Polybius, and later tradition, but that contemporary Sparta was censured by Ephorus, assuming that the prologue to Diodorus xv is drawn from Ephorus. The reforms of Agis and Cleomenes provide firmer evidence and lead to an interesting study of Phylarchus, who is regarded by M. Ollier as Plutarch's main source. At this point the Stoics' admiration for Sparta is brought to bear: for not only is Phylarchus a Stoic, but M. Ollier finds in the Stoic Sphaerus the political adviser of both Agis and Cleomenes. It is conjectured that Sphaerus visited Ptolemy Philadelphus, advised Agis (for which there is no specific evidence), advised Cleomenes, and accompanied him to the court of Ptolemy Philopator. But conjecture goes still farther. Sphaerus wrote two treatises, *The Spartan Constitution* and *Lycurgus and Socrates*, of which only the titles and two fragments survive; M. Ollier sets out to reconstruct their contents. In tackling the first treatise he argues that Sphaerus' ideas were applied in the reforms of

Agis and Cleomenes, and Sphaerus' attitude to Sparta is revealed by Plutarch, who used Phylarchus, who used Sphaerus as his source. As regards the *Lycurgus and Socrates* M. Ollier writes: 'Au sujet des intentions qui avaient déterminé le philosophe stoïcien à traiter à la fois de ces deux personnages illustres aucun doute ne me paraît possible. . . . Ce que Sphaeros avait prétendu démontrer, c'est que Lycurgue était déjà un véritable philosophe, une sorte de Socrate avant la lettre.' He then considers the extent to which Sphaerus' theories influenced the reforms in detail. When we reconsider the ultimate basis of evidence underpinning these conjectures, we must view M. Ollier's conclusions with some alarm.

The last two chapters are mainly concerned with the attitude of Polybius and Plutarch towards Sparta. The treatment of both authors shows a keen insight into their psychology and their aims; in particular, M. Ollier suggests that during the course of writing his history Polybius changed his opinion both of Sparta and of Rome and ended by regarding 'the city of Lycurgus as the sister of the city of the Scipios'. And in Plutarch's *Life of Lycurgus*, which M. Ollier treats with a happy sympathy, the vision of Sparta appears for the last time, a mirage over the desert of Greek decadence.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

Clare College, Cambridge.

TIBERIUS

D. M. PIPPIDI: *Autour de Tibère*. Pp. 201. Bucarest: Institutul de Istorie universală 'N. Iorga', 1944. Paper.

THOUGH this generation has been more concerned with economic and constitutional trends than with personalities, the character of Tiberius has attracted continuous study. Tacitus still imposes his will or his challenge.

In this book are collected a series of articles on Tiberius which have appeared in various French and Rumanian periodicals between 1932 and 1942. The most substantial is a study of the

Tacitean portrait which shows a sound grasp of the extensive bibliography. In its conclusions it has much in common with Jerome's essay in his *Aspects of the Study of Roman History*, but the argument is considerably elaborated and the presentation less incisive. Pippidi, after discussing ancient historical methods, argues that Tacitus' contribution was the creation of a formal artistic (and artificial) portrait, a consistent moral interpretation in which hypocrisy is the dominant element. The view of Schwartz (P.-W., s.v. 'Dio'), that the main lines of interpretation

were fixed before Tacitus wrote, and that Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio drew their main outline from a common source, is rejected. The element of hypocrisy, the keynote in Tacitus, is unobtrusive in Suetonius, and in Dio it is concentrated in 57. 1, which derives from Tacitus, whereas the later running commentary on Tiberius' character in Dio is inconsistent with this introduction and drawn from other sources.

That Tacitus created a more integrated portrait of Tiberius than his predecessors may well be true—certainly a more vivid one. That he was the first to stress hypocrisy is very difficult to prove, and an examination of Dio is crucial to the argument. Pippidi accepts without question the conclusion of Bergmans (*Die Quellen der Vita Tiberii des Cassius Dio*) that Dio's first chapter, which emphasizes hypocrisy, is a generalization from Tacitus' account of the opening debate in the Senate. This conclusion is surely controversial, and, until more is known of Agrippina's memoirs and other pre-Tacitean sources, some critics will prefer to leave the credit for the invention of Tiberius' hypocrisy an open question. Among the main elements in the real Tiberius were surely suspicion and a tendency to slowness in decision. That was the natural result of his treatment by Augustus and the fact that he was nearing sixty when he began to rule. To interpret these unattractive features as hypocrisy surely did not have to wait for a Tacitus.

Small but solid advances are made in two shorter studies. The official dating of Tiberius' Principate from 29 August in Egypt, rather than 19 August, the date of Augustus' death, is shown to reflect Tiberius' hesitation in formally assuming the Principate rather than delay in receiving the news. *I.G.* xiv. 902 is shown to throw no sinister light on Tiberius' wild orgies on Capri

but to be 'une épitaphe qui développe sans originalité les *τόποι* ordinaires de la poésie funéraire' (probably 2nd century).

Less successful is the new interpretation of Tiberius' treatment of L. Arruntius, who governed Spain from Rome. P. finds the clue in Dio lviii. 8. 3 *ὁ Τιβέριος ἐχθρόν τινα αὐτοῦ* [Sejanus] *ῥημένον μὲν πρὸ δέκα ἐτῶν Ἰβηρίας ἀρξαι, κρινόμενον δὲ ἐπὶ τισιν ἐξ ἐκείνου ἀφῆκε. ἐξ ἐκείνου* is taken in a temporal sense. Arruntius was kept in Rome from the time of his appointment with a threat of trial over him which was not quashed until A.D. 31. This is a strained translation: the long-drawn suspense is in itself improbable and would probably have left a clearer hint in the sources. *ἐξ ἐκείνου* is more easily taken to refer to Sejanus.

P. has some interesting things to say on Dio's attitude to the imperial cult: he also discusses Tiberius' reply when divine honours were offered by Baetica (*Ann.* iv. 37. 8). Lösch found a parallel in the Pseudo-Callisthenic *Life of Alexander*, and attributed the speech to a Greek secretary. P. rightly claims more credit for Tiberius, and compares the inscriptions from Gytheum. He has, however, gone from one extreme to the other. Though the formulation bears the stamp of personal conviction, Tiberius' reply gives the stock official attitude of the early emperors. The view that Tiberius was a follower of Stoicism is, we think, pressed farther than the evidence allows.

The book is completed by P.'s reviews of the studies on Tiberius by Baker, Marsh, Tarver, Ciaceri.

Those who make a special study of Tiberius will find useful material in these collected articles, though they are not likely to agree with all the conclusions.

RUSSELL MEIGGS.

Balliol College, Oxford.

SHORT REVIEWS

Heinrich PESTALOZZI: *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*. Pp. 52. Zürich: Rentsch, 1945. Paper, 7 Sw. fr.

ACCEPTING the conclusions of Schadewaldt's *Iliasstudien*, P. has produced a short specimen of 'Quellenanalyse' (Schadewaldt, op. cit., p. 164). He claims to have discovered one of Homer's main sources in an earlier *Achilleis*, parts of which can be restored in outline by a comparison of certain episodes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* with what we know of the *Aethiopis*.

The first and longest section of P.'s essay (pp. 5-37) sets out the evidence for the *Achilleis*, and reconstructs its last three episodes: Achilles' killing of Memnon, the death of Achilles, and the funeral of Achilles. All these were narrated in the *Aethiopis*, and P. generally speaks as if the *Aethiopis* were identical with the *Achilleis*. At other times he appears with greater caution to regard the *Achilleis* as having been a common source for the *Iliad* and for the *Aethiopis*.

In his second section (pp. 38-45) P. deals with Homer's relation to the *Achilleis*, distinguishing the elements which Homer took over from his source from the additions which he made out of his own head; the latter including the *Menis*, Achilles' relationship with Patroclus, and the killing of Hector. P. lays special emphasis on Homer's development of a new style of epic narrative, in which 'Mehrschichtigkeit' replaces the 'Gradlinigkeit' characteristic of earlier epic.

In his third section (pp. 46-52) P. surveys the history of epic on the basis of his own conclusions. He ranges from the time when the Helen-story had nothing to do with Troy to the creation of the Epic Cycle to suit the requirements of Pisistratus' reorganization of the Panathenaea.

P.'s reconstruction of his *Achilleis* is not unconvincing; but the conclusions which he draws from that reconstruction are not always supported by logic or evidence. The book has neither bibliography nor index.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

Charles Newton SMILEY: *Horace, his Poetry and Philosophy*. Pp. 42. New York, King's Crown Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Paper, 6s. 6d. net.

THIS short account of Horace is intended for the layman. The first five pages outline his life and ideas; the next twenty-eight give a digest of his works, with translations in prose of selected passages diversified by specimens of the 'pepped-up' travesties of Eugene Field; and the last seven contain an appreciation. There is nothing here that is fresh, though the presentation is quite lively, and little that is controversial. Here and there a sentence might be modified: 'These odes are modeled not after the work of the Alexandrian Greeks, but after the great Greek lyric poets of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.' (p. 12). That is largely true of their form at least; but the author nowhere indicates their great debt in content and

spirit to Hellenistic poetry, which is fully demonstrated, for instance, in Pasquali's *Oratio Lirica*. 'Whether he borrowed from Neoptolemus or not, we can affirm this,—that Horace did not set down in the *Ars Poetica* any principle of style that he had not followed himself' (p. 31). That he did, in fact, borrow from Neoptolemus, as Porphyrio said, has been made practically certain by Jensen's researches; and it is not so certain that he did always keep his own rules. It is a little fanciful to say (p. 35) that Horace is a loving interpreter, not only of the beauty of Italy, but of 'the beauty of a certain ideal land that lies somewhere beyond the north wind's blast, in the world of Platonic ideas'.

But Professor Smiley's comments and appreciation are generally just. For thirty-five years, he tells us, he read the odes with a class of sophomores, and each year meant an increased devotion to the author on the part of the teacher—no doubt also on the part of the pupils, who will be glad to have this memento of their humane guide.

L. P. WILKINSON.

King's College, Cambridge.

Axel DAHL: *Augustin und Plotin*. Philosophische Untersuchungen zum Trinitätsproblem und zur Nuslehre. Pp. 118. Lund: Lindstedt, 1945. Paper, 4 kr.

It is ten years since the author published the second of two parallel studies entitled *Odödlighetsproblemet hos Plotinos* (1934) and *Odödlighetsproblemet hos Augustinus* (1935). His new tractate, translated for him into German by Herr Casimir Fontaine, falls into three sections, 'Augustin', 'Augustin und Plotin', and 'Plotin', with an interesting little excursus on the bearing of his own investigations on the conclusions of Père Paul Henry, S.J., in *Plotin et l'Occident* (1934), as to the extent and limitations of Augustine's knowledge of Plotinus. The analytical discussion of Augustine's philosophical doctrine in particular aspects, whether it follows the lines of Alfarié or Schmaus or Nygren, when compared with studies of the philosophy of Plotinus treated separately, can readily be shown to suggest parallelisms. And any one who devotes attention specially to the second, fifth, and sixth books of the *De Trinitate* will be struck by language in regard to the Son which almost irresistibly suggests affinity with aspects of the teaching to be found in Plotinus in relation to the Nous. It may seem and perhaps is perverse to insist that where there is a reasonable probability, to say the least, of acquaintance of one author with the writings of another and an earlier author, where for example there is ground for thinking that Augustine had read in some form the fifth Ennead, any similarity does not for all that necessarily imply direct indebtedness except so far as one method of treatment may directly or indirectly suggest another. But such judicious caution renders more impressive the fact of the existence of passages, even if they are not numerous, where deliberate adaptation is a more natural

explanation than a reference to some concept or treatment from which both may be held to depend. That it should be adaptation and not wholesale borrowing is only to be expected, and the writer ends a delightfully picturesque paragraph of his conclusion with the words: 'Es ist aber nicht länger ein griechischer Tempel sondern ein christlicher Dom.'

CLAUDE JENKINS.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Pieter STEUR, C.M.: *Het Karakter van Hieronymus van Stridon bestudeerd in zijn brieven*. Pp. xii + 234. Nijmegen and Utrecht: Dekker and v.d. Vegt, 1945. Paper.

THIS is an attempt to assess St. Jerome's character systematically from his letters by statistical methods—and it is systematic with a vengeance. Jerome's letters are taken in four chronological groups. The subject-matter of each letter is classified under the following heads: biological, material, cultural, Jerome himself, social, ethical, religious. Each heading (except Jerome himself) has, so to speak, a positive and negative half, such that 'cultural' includes stupidity and lack of learning, while 'religious' covers bad actions or attitudes towards God. Jerome's references to these themes are further grouped as pro and con (*waarde* and *onwaarde*). Consequently, a comprehensive table for each chronological group should pin down his attitude to life with arithmetical precision. Moreover, lest quality of reaction be omitted, each reference gets its emotional classification and separate tables of emotions are provided (e.g. in group I, 133 expressions of wish or demand, but none of fear).

I hesitate to disparage such enormous labours; yet I cannot see their value. The imposing tables obscure the difficulty of exact classification, miss shades of meaning, and take no account of the contingencies of letter-writing. The 'pro and con' scheme itself is faulty. It can be tautological, for 'religious' is necessarily all *waarde* and 'religious' all *onwaarde*; and it can be misleading, when Jerome's disclaimer of literary ability (Ep. 1) goes down as genuine self-depreciation. Finally, the conclusions are disproportionate to the travail—*ridiculus mus*. Whatever its merits when used to elicit average laws from large numbers, the statistical method cannot supply the delicacy necessary for insight into individual personality. Is there not a parable in this well-meaning but misguided book?

S. L. GREENSLADE.

University of Durham.

Sister Miriam Dolores TOBIN, C.S.C.: *Oriental Commonitorium*. A Commentary with an Introduction and Translation. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. LXXIV.) Pp. xv + 143. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1945. Paper.

THIS book, like so many others of the series to which it belongs, takes the form of a Ph.D. thesis, and the authoress, who is interested mainly in the vocabulary and syntax of patristic Latin, has to embed her work on these matters in what purports

to be a full-dress edition of her author, a task for which she has obviously no aptitude and few qualifications. But the pages of the Introduction (pp. 23–50), in which she deals with her own particular line are within their limits a competent piece of work, though here and there a lack of thorough acquaintance with the historical background is apparent. The text is that of R. Ellis (Vienna, 1888) except in three passages: there is a list of 'sources' (pp. 8–22), that is to say, passages in previous authors, both prose and verse, from whom Orientius is supposed to borrow a phrase or a word, but many of these are highly doubtful, and one of the most obvious is omitted, the half line of Propertius (ii. 15. 24) quoted in ii. 230. The translation is loose and ungainly and is marred by many errors, some elementary (e.g. the translation of *fugiet* in i. 3 as though it were *fugiat* and that of *leuia*, beginning a hexameter, as 'light'), others due to lack of knowledge of Latin idiom (e.g. the translation of *dare uerba* (ii. 116) as 'utter angry words'), with many others too numerous to detail. On ii. 285 Ellis has a note explaining the meaning of the text which he punctuates so as to bring out the *ordo uerborum*: his punctuation is retained but the note apparently has not been understood, for the translation given is wrong. And there are too many misprints.

R. M. HENRY.

University of St. Andrews.

Odo John ZIMMERMANN: *The Late Latin Vocabulary of the Variae of Cassiodorus*. (Catholic University of America: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, Vol. XV.) Pp. xx + 277. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1944. Paper, \$2.75.

THE reader of the *Variae* finds much that is hard to interpret. The difficulty is partly one of syntax (we already have in this series a discussion of the syntax of the *Variae* from Skahill), but mainly one of vocabulary. Unless one is a specialist in the history of the period, the technical terms of administration require constant reference to Pauly-Wissowa and other authorities. In addition, Cassiodorus' extensive vocabulary contains many new words, as well as old words employed in senses which from the classical point of view are in various degrees novel. The present work does much to help. Over 50 pages are devoted to notes on technical terms with references to standard authorities which should save the general reader a good deal of trouble. The main part of the book contains a treatment of the vocabulary under the headings, usual in this series, of 'Neologisms', 'Words of Recent Coinage', and 'Changes of Meaning'.

The section on Semantics is the most interesting. One feels that an attempt to trace the history of some of these changes of meaning would be a useful task for research. Some, indeed, of the new meanings or meanings 'not mentioned in the lexicon' are not quite accurately so labelled. *Auribus remulsis* (p. 126) of a horse laying back his ears is practically the same usage as we see in *caudam remulcere* of *Aen.* xi. 812. *Ab obsequio*

reliquit (on the same page) 'allowed him to leave his service' shows *relinquere* with that sense of permission which is already foreshadowed in *Lucr.* iii. 40 and *Hor. Sat.* i. i. 52 (*dum ex parvo nobis tantundem haurire relinquas*). In several cases one wishes that the author would translate, at least partially, the passages he quotes. *Anguste* with verbs of selling and the like means 'at a high price'; one would naturally conclude that *arte* should have the same meaning, and that is the view of Traube in his *Index* and also of the *Thesaurus*. Z., however (p. 116), without explaining adequately the rather puzzling passage where the word occurs, gives the meaning 'at a low price'. In a passage about the amenities of Comum, Cassiodorus says *Haec* (Comum civitas) *post tergum campestris culta transmittit*, and then goes on to mention the attractions it offers *a fronte*. Z. (p. 129) discovers here a 'new' meaning for *transmittere*, 'to send forth (of plants, etc.)', which is clearly wrong since *campestris culta* means 'cultivated flat-lands'. The change of meaning is from 'overlook, pass over' to something like 'leave behind'. These and a few other items which seem open to criticism do not affect my opinion that this work will smooth the way considerably for students of the *Variae*.

J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

Excavations at Dura-Europos. Final Report IV. Part II: The Textiles. By R. PFISTER and Louisa BELLINGER. Pp. viii + 64; 34 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1945. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.

THE textiles from Dura are important not only because of their number and variety, but still more because of their provenance and early date. They show us what were the materials, techniques, and ornaments of the first half of the third Christian century in Upper Mesopotamia: apart from the finds from Palmyra, which cannot be dated, they are the only body of documents of their kind, to which we cannot expect to get large additions in the future. The catalogue of all the pieces found by the Yale expedition, which forms the bulk of the present volume, has been prepared with painstaking care by Miss Louisa Bellinger; the commentary is based on the studies carried out by M. Pfister before the outbreak of the war, but had to be somewhat amplified by the editors in the light of more recent discoveries.

The great bulk of the Dura material is in wool; but isolated fragments of silk and cotton as well as some linen have also been found. Separate chapters are devoted to techniques, colours, and the different types of garments of which these fragments were part. Through a comparison with the dresses on the frescoes of the Synagogue, very valuable contributions to our knowledge of late antique costume are obtained. The ornamental decorations are comparatively modest and few; and most of the decorated textiles apparently did not belong to garments at all, but were used for a variety of other purposes. From the artistic point of view, the textiles from Dura cannot com-

pare with the masterpieces of late antique weaving which we possess from burying-grounds in Egypt. But the high scholarly standard of this second fascicle of the Final Report makes us all the more impatient for those volumes which will deal with the more interesting aspects of the excavation of this unique site.

H. BUCHTHAL.

Warburg Institute, London.

Agnes Carr VAUGHAN: *The Genesis of Human Offspring. A Study in Early Greek Culture.* (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 13.) Pp. viii + 117. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College, 1945. Paper, 75 c.

PROFESSOR VAUGHAN, who holds the Chair of Classics at Smith College, was moved to study Greek beliefs, or survivals of beliefs, in what she calls non-biological genesis by some lectures of Dr. M. E. Ashley-Montagu on Australian, especially Arunta (or Aranda), ideas on reproduction. Putting it briefly, these comparatively primitive people, who are alleged to have no idea of the part of the male in procreation, also have no notion how a woman conceives, but hold that in all cases a *kuruna* (thought of as a small but material being; the translation 'spirit-child', though common, is misleading) enters her body and in due course comes forth as a human baby. The belief, in the case of the Arunta, is bound up with their system of social classification, which is totemic, combined with a non-totemic exogamous arrangement. The conclusion drawn, by some anthropologists at least, is that they cannot think of children as in any proper sense the blood-kin of either parent.

The present monograph, after a clear sketch of the Australian data, proceeds to muster a number of Greek rites, beliefs, and even philosophical theories all pointing to this much, at all events, of something like the Arunta doctrine surviving in Greece, that not all women conceive, or at any rate not all women or goddesses in times past conceived, in the normal fashion, but had conveyed into them from without a sort of *kuruna*, wind- or water-borne in some cases, coming from the rays of the sun in others, not infrequently contained in something which the mother ate. In view of all this, several novel and not unpalatable interpretations of legends and rites are offered. But the suggestion on p. 67 that because the ancestors of the historical Greeks may have had something like Arunta beliefs on this point they are at all likely to have had a similar social pattern is unsupported by the evidence.

Generally the Greek facts are accurately given, though here and there they seem to be taken at second-hand. An occasional slip needs correction; on pp. 43, 107 it is stated that the ghosts in Plutarch, *Mor.* 564 c neither open nor shut their eyes. What is said there is that they cast no shadow and do not blink. On p. 65, an unlikely translation of *Et. Mag.* 471. 1 ff. makes Zeus tell Prometheus and Athena to breathe the winds into their clay figures; it is more probable that he bade the winds breathe into them.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLI. 3: JULY, 1946

C. D. Buck, *The Dialect of Cyrene*: supplements his *Greek Dialects* with material from new inscriptions. E. H. Haight, *The Lyre and the Whetstone*: appraises Horace's creative and critical qualities. J. P. Cooke, *Notes on Statius' Thebais*: full illustrative notes on passages often misunderstood; ii. 16-18 (*ad superos* = 'in the upper world'; *gravis exitus aevi* = 'a dreadful death'; *insultare malis* balances *rebus aegrescere laetis*), x. 319 (*lucrata dolores* = 'having escaped the pains'), iv. 532 (*poenarum lucra* = 'the penalties they had escaped'), x. 788 (*veris honore soluto* = 'scattered spring flowers'). L. A. Mackay, *The Earthquake-Horse*: suggests that the fall of Troy was due to an earthquake, symbolized by Poseidon's horse; hence the legend of the Trojan Horse. L. B. Lawler, *Pindar and some Animal Dances*: refers *Pyth.* x. 36 ὄβριον ὀρίταν κνωδάλων to comic animal dances in honour of Apollo. W. A. Oldfather, *Oasis, Oasa*: twice indisputably attested by the manuscripts in Jerome, *Vita S. Hilar.* 33-4 and twice found elsewhere in patristic writings, may be an alternative form. E. Wyckoff: in *Pind. Pyth.* ii. 52-6 takes τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμνηχανίᾳ with the subject, Pindar himself. J. Day, *Pausanias and the Pentelic Quarries*: Paus. i. 19. 6 need not imply that Herodes owned the quarries, since it may be dative of agent with ἀνθλῶσθι. G. H. Macurdy: in *Soph. Ant.* 528 αἰματόεν is not 'darkly flushing' (Jebb); Ismene has torn her cheeks with her nails.

XLI. 4: OCTOBER, 1946

R. McKeon, *Aristotle's Conception of Language and the Arts of Language*. D. M. Robinson, *The Wheel of Fortune*: collects instances of the figure from Greek (*Pind. Ol.* 2. 23-4, *Soph.* fr. 575, 871), Latin, and medieval literature. A. Neumann, *Das römische Heeresreglement*: on the content of the *constitutiones militares* of Augustus, Trajan, and Hadrian, and the sources of Vegetius. G. K. Meadows, *Hiatus and Vocalic Quality in Classical and Vulgar Latin*: concludes from Romance forms that the shortening of the first of two vowels in hiatus within a word was prosodic only and that the quality of the vowel did not change. R. Lattimore, *Pindar, Ol.* 9. 100-112: relates this to *Ol.* 2. 86-8 and its assumed allusion to Simonides and suggests that P. is here conveying an oblique apology to Simonides, recently dead. G. M. Bolling, *Wackernagel's Psilotic Homer*: finds evidence of survival of original psilosis in *Il.* 12. 75 (ἀγερ' ὤς), 9. 167 (ἀγερ' ὀς).

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

LXVI. 3: JULY, 1945

B. M. Metzger, *St. Jerome's Testimony Concerning the Second Grade of Mithraic Initiation*: relying on the graffiti in the Mithraeum at Dura-Europos, as well as on the manuscripts, restores *nymphus*, in

place of *cryphius*, in Jerome, *Ep.* cvii. 2, and understands it to mean 'bridegroom'. B. D. Meritt, *Three Attic Inscriptions*: those discussed are: an ephebic catalogue of 333/332 B.C., *I.G.* ii². 2976, the Prytany of Aiantis in 319/318, *I.G.* ii². 386, and *E.M.* 12564, and Athens and Rhodes in 251/250, *I.G.* ii². 769 and 441. C. A. Robinson, *Athenian Politics, 510-486 B.C.*: reaffirms, in opposition to A. W. Gomme in *A.J.P.* lxxv, pp. 321 ff., that (a) the 'tyrannists' were a definite party c. 500 B.C. united with the aristocrats out of common pro-Spartan and pro-Persian sympathies, and (b) the Archonship was thrown open to lot as a move in a campaign to make one-man power possible. B. D. Meritt, *A Note on I.G.* i². 87: accepts L. A. Post's suggestion that the aorist with εἰς ἄν, previously read, is impossible. C. Pharr, *The Text of Gratian's Decretum* ii. 32, 45: proposes *ve(h)emens* for the meaningless *uceniens* of the manuscript, and discusses the origin and character of the conception of *adulterium* presented. F. W. Householder, *The First Chapter of the Poetics*: insists that *ἐκνομοία* cannot be defended in 1447^a28, and that the passage must be read with plurals in place of the singulars caused by the intrusion of this word, and with ἀντοῖς μυρούμεναι supplied after τοῖς μέτροις. W. A. Nitze, *Spitzer's Grail Etymology*: maintains the derivation of O.F. *graal* from *crater(a)* by defending *cratus* and *gradalis* as real words. J. N. Hough, *The Numquid Vis Formula in Roman Comedy*: suggests that this is by no means always used conventionally, but may either (a) introduce an extra comic effect, or (b) mask the transition from the original to a 'Roman insertion'. S. Simonson, *A Definitive Note on the Enthymeme*: argues that Aristotle intended his 'enthymematic *topoi*' as practical illustrations of his four types of premise. D. W. Prakken, *Two Latin Inscriptions at Indiana University*: gives a full description, and suggests possible connexions with other inscriptions already published. W. A. Oldfather, *Brief Notes on 'The Vernacular Proverb in Mediaeval Latin Prose'*: offers sources and parallels, especially from the Bible, for certain proverbs in Steiner's collection, *A.J.P.* lxxv, pp. 49-68. R. Lattimore, *Two Notes on the Agamemnon of Aeschylus*: (a) defends ὁ λαχόντες of the manuscripts in 577, and (b) refers 575-9 not to the dramatically existing situation, but to glorious reputation in the distant future.

ERANOS

1939, fasc. 3-4

S. Blomgren, *Ad Optatum Milevitanum adnotationes*: criticizes the choice of readings in Ziwsa's edition and supplements his indexes. G. Rudberg, *En svensk Anakreon-tolkning*: publishes a 'variation' on *Anacreontea* III by Ernst Kjellander (1812-35). E. J. Holmberg, *Voro grekerna autokhona?*: examines and rejects Valmin's theory that the Middle Helladic ancestors of the Greeks were a subject people who had overthrown their Early Helladic Anatolian conquerors.

1940

E. Nachmanson, *Zu den griechischen Doppelpräpositionen*: calls attention to the occurrence of such compounds as ἀπὸ διὰ, κατὰ πρὸς, etc., mostly in inscriptions and medical authors. A. Boethius, *A proposito di una osservazione importante sullo stile dorico ed una interpretazione del Vitruvio* (iv. 2. 4): calls attention to Zancani's deduction (Palladio, 1940) from the triglyphs of the Heraion near the mouth of the R. Sele that the triglyphs represent vertical posts which in the primitive wooden temple stood on the architrave to carry the cornice. A. Andrén, *Några anmärkningar rörande det etruskiska templet iakonstruktion*: criticizes E. Wistrand's theory (Eranos, 1939) that the Etruscan temple developed from a cella and a yard, parts of which were later roofed over to form pronaos and lateral cellae. H. Frisk, *Gratus, Gratia und Verwandtes*: suggests possible semantic developments for this group of words. G. Björck, *Μισθοφόροι et Ἀντιλέων, deux calembours par calachrèse chez Aristophane*: maintains that μισθοφόροι τριήρεις (Knights, 555) were ships whose crews had been paid, and that Ἀντιλέων (ibid. 1044) means both 'lion-like' and 'anti-Leon', Leon being some unknown politician. H. Frisk, *Zur griechischen Wortkunde*: (1) χαλκοκορυστής is from κόρυς, cf. ἀγχεμαχητής and ἀγχεμαχος, (2) συνοχμός stands metri gratia for συνοχμός, (3) κειμήλιον? < κοιμάω + κείμαι, (4) δόκος is so accented, being from δάκος intrans., (5) the meanings of πάρος. T. Kleberg, *Weinfälschung—ein stilistisches Klischee bei den Kirchen Vätern*. H. Hagendahl, *Notices sur le texte du Querolus*: criticizes Herrmann's reliance on the manuscript B. S. Blomgren, *Om några ställen i Paulini Nolani carmina*: suggests some emendations. E. Svenberg, *Quelques remarques sur les 'Sortes Sangallenses'*: brings parallels from the *Lunaria*. H. Zilliacus, *Griechische Papyrusurkunden des VII Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*: publishes with a commentary Pap. Brit. Mus. 2017, 2018, 2019—legal proceedings over a house, a contract for buying a house, and a marriage contract. E. Nachmanson, *Zur Aussprache des η im Spätgriechischen*: claims that Plotinus' habit of saying ἀναμνησικεταί for ἀναμνησικεταί shows that he did not confuse η and ι. S. Blomgren, *Zu Prudentius c. Symm. I 256*: shows that faulty punctuation has given rise to a belief in a substantive *geniale* (= *genialis lectus*).

1941

M. P. Nilsson, *The Immortality of the Soul in Greek Religion*. E. Wistrand, *Gratus, grates, gratia, gratus*: explains that *gratus* as the verbal adjective of a lost verb is both active and passive; *gratias* (*grates*) *agere*, *habere* are to be distinguished from *gratiam habere* as the concrete expression from the sentiment, and were originally used of ritual (note *agere*) thanks to gods; *gratius* means 'with thanks only (no payment)'; the article concludes with a good study of the social implications of *gratia* and *gratiosus*. G. Bendz, *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Petronius*: criticizes editors for unnecessary supplements and for trying to draw too sharp a distinction between the narrative style

and that of the speakers; discusses various other points, including the interpretation of 66 (7), 57 (8), 68 (8), 55 (4). C. Blum, *Manuscript Studies in Artemidorus*: gives results of a collation of Cod. Laur. 87. 8, and lists some other manuscripts that contain fragments of A. B. Axelson, *Echtheits- und textkritische Kleinigkeiten*: (1) W. Kugler has recognized *Anth. Lat. i. 2* Append. 950. 8 as being Persius v. 52-3, but is wrong in claiming the third line *dissimilis cunctis uox uultus uoluntas uita* (sic) for Persius: it is manufactured from the scholium on l. 52; (2) [Cyprian] *quod idola dii non sunt* shows knowledge of Lactantius; (3) emendations of Tertullian *Apol. 9. 18*, Minucius Felix 29. 6, Arnobius ii. 67, v. 42, vi. 22. S. Blomgren, *De duobus epitaphiis episcoporum, utrum Venantio Fortunato attribuenda sint necne*: decides against. D. Norberg, *Syntaktisch-kritische Bemerkungen zu den Avellana-Briefen*. A. Cavallin, (70) *Λοιπὸν*, traces the use of this phrase from classical to modern Greek. G. Rudberg and S. Linnér, *Herodotea*: deal with some variants in papyri. E. Nachmanson, *Note sur un passage d'Euripide*: defends *συμβάλλεται* at *Med. 284*. A. Boethius, *La datazione dei mattoni romani*: suggests that the bricks were exposed to weathering for some years before sale and dated for the benefit of the customer.

1942

B. Knös, *Les 'grecs du roi'*: a centenary article on the Greek type made by R. Estienne to the order of Francis I. J. Bergman, *Ein antikt epigram vandrings genom skilda sekler och länder*: traces variants of a Latin version of *Anth. graec. ix. 49*. A. Wistrand, *Die griechischen Verba für wollen*: an important article on *ἐθέλω* and *βούλομαι*. In Thucydides and Attic orators *ἐθέλω* always implies readiness to agree to another's will; seven exceptions are explicable as quotations from earlier texts and two others are of the type *ὅτι ἂν ἐθέλῃ*, of which Plato became very fond in his later works. Plato also uses *ἐθέλω* (particularly in protasis) with the nuance that the action would be unexpected or distasteful. Xenophon departs most frequently from the Attic rule in *Anab.* and *Cyr.*, never in *Hell.* In Hellenistic Greek *βούλομαι* was the favoured 'literary' word, but the Atticist revival brought back *ἐθέλω* without its former restrictions of usage. T. Wikström, *Firmiciana*: discusses the text of many passages. H. Frisk, *Zur griechischen Wortkunde*: discusses the etymology of *δρύσσαι*, *δρύεσθαι*, *δενδρύειν*, *νηρίδας*, *ὀμφή* (= *ὀσμή*), *λιπαρέω* and *λιπαρής*, *βεβόλημαι*, *λῶμα*. R. Strömberg, *Λοβός*: arranges 19 meanings of this word. E. Nachmanson, *Edvard Gyldestolpes resa till Konstantinopel 1701-1702*: publishes some of this traveller's observations on classical antiquities, and adds notes on some other seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Swedish travellers to the East. G. Rudberg, *Vor Gorgias; Bemerkungen zur ältesten griechischen Prosa*: is chiefly remarkable for supporting Frisch's view (*Classica et Mediaevalia* 1942) that [Xen.] *Al. Pol.* is earlier than 431. E. Wistrand, *Bemerkungen zu Vitruv*: (1) origin of triglyphs and metopes; (2) v. i. 9 and vi. 8. 2; (3) *cymatium*; (4) *mutulus*; (5) *stillicidium*; (6) primi-

tive forms of roof; (7) *derós, aquila*; (8) look-out towers in Roman villas; (9) ii. 8. 19; (10) v. 12. 3 describes a method of making a mole by erecting a pillar on the shore and then causing it to fall into the sea; this explains *Aen.* 9. 708 ff., *Silius* 4. 293 ff., and *Herc. Fur.* 1046. G. Björck, *A propos de Solon I, II*: defends the reading of the manuscripts. B. Axelsson, *Randbemerkungen zu Arnobius*.

1943

M. P. Nilsson, *Die Quellen der Lethe und der Mnemosyne*: ascribes both springs (as opposed to the river of Lethe) to Orphic invention. G. Lugli, *Les débuts de la Romanité à la lumière des découvertes archéologiques modernes*: remarks on the impressive remains of the 'Etruscan' period at Rome. C. Blum, *Some Observations on Artemon from Miletos and his Dream-book*. D. Norberg, *Zur Kritik und Erklärung einiger Iordanesstellen*. E. Wistrand, *De Lucretii prooemii interpretatione*: argues that the lines do not imply the actual existence of a state of war. H. Frisk, *Zur griechischen Wortkunde*: etymologies of *δοῶν, ἔγωγε, τημελεῖν, λοιδορεῖν, κλισίη*. G. Bendz, *Zu Caelius Aurelianus*: emendations. H. Ericsson, *Sulla Felix*: maintains that Sulla regarded himself as the favourite not of *Τύχη*, but of the traditional gods, and this interpretation is supported by those critics who said that proscriptions and *felicitas* were incompatible. T. Kleberg, *Ad Hor. Carm. iv. 3, 22-24*. I. Düring, *Khulaimestra*: traces the use in poetry of the legend, and argues that Pindar *Pyth. xi* shows the influence of Aeschylus. E. Wistrand, *Vitruvius om antik murbyggnadsteknik* (ii. 8): translation and commentary. C. Theander, *Lesbiaca*: reconstructions of poems by Sappho and Alcaeus.

XLII: 1944

G. Carlsson, *Zu einigen Oden des Horaz*: on i. 14, 26, 32, ii. 18, iii 16, 24, with particular reference to Horace's political feelings. A. G. Elg, *In Faustum Reiensem adversaria*. B. Axelsson, *Einschränkendes tamquam*: a Silver Latin development. H. Ericsson, *Caesar und sein Glück*: nothing in Caesar's writings indicates that he felt himself a favourite of the gods or of fortune, though he was ready to encourage others to believe it. M. P. Nilsson, *Die eleusinischen Kulte der attischen Demen und das neue Sakralgesetz aus Paiania*: these cults emphasized the agricultural side of the Eleusinian deities. D. Norberg, *Ps.-Cypr. tract. ix et 26*. E. Wistrand, *De Amm. Marc. 27. 7. 7 interpretando*. S. Blomgren, *De Venantio Fortunato Vergilii aliorumque poetarum priorum Imitatore*. H. Lyngby, *Beiträge zur römischen Topographie*: (1) Porta Flumentana was on SW. of Aventine; (2) course of Servian pomerium near the Tiber; (3) Livy 29. 37. 2 and 41. 27. 9 (*via circa foros publicos*); (4) early structure of the *carceres* in Circus Maximus. S. Blomgren, *In Venantii Fortunati carmina adnotationes*. S. Eriksson, *Ad I 2 Anthologiarum Vettii Valentis*. J. Mjöberg, *Virgil Aen. I 608: polus dum sidera pascet*, 'while the pole-star leads the flock of stars to graze'. E. Wistrand, *Pomp. Mela 2, 16 emendatur*.

XLIII: 1945

This volume is a *Festschrift* for Einar Löfstedt, and contains a provisional bibliography of his writings.

A. Andrén, *Stillicidium*: lexicographical, supports 'eaves' as the rendering of its architectural use. B. Axelsson, *Eine ovidische Echtheitsfrage*: condemns *Halieutica* as spurious. G. Bendz, *Some Critical Latin Word Studies*: denies the existence of *imprincpaliter, impigens, columbinaceus, aliquilibet, aliquicunque*, etc., *insanitiue*, and claims that of *resimpticare*. G. Björck, *Die Schicksalswaage*: explains *Il. xxii. 209* as based on an established method of divination by weights. F. Blatt, *La Latinité de la Vie de Saint Honoré*. A. Boethius, *Maeniana*: argues that the balconies (*maeniana*) round the Forum were established by C. Maenius in 318 B.C., and that there were two *columnae Maenianae*, the original column in honour of this Maenius, and another (so-called in jest) which supported the balcony reserved by his descendant when he sold the family house in 184 B.C. G. Carlsson, *The Hero and Fate in Virgil's Aeneid*: a somewhat popular lecture. A. Cavallin, *Die Legendbildung um den Mailänder Bischof Dionysius*. S. Cavallin, *Saint Genès le notaire*: prints a critical text of the *Passio*, which he takes to be later than the *Sermo*. The latter may be by Hilary of Arles, the former by some sixth-century author. I. Düring, *Studies in Musical Terminology in 5th Century Literature*: comments on the famous fragment of Pherecrates. S. Ek, *Eine Stillendenz in der römischen Archäologie des Dionysios von Halikarnass*: two closely connected words separated by a long and sonorous phrase. H. Frisk, *Griechische Wortprobleme: μῦθος* (rejects the view that Greek has feminine adjectives used as abstract nouns), *ἄλυσος* < **ylu-*, *ἀπακιδῶν* perhaps associated with *uertigo*. E. Gjerstad, *The Story of the Chatsworth Head*: proves that it belonged to a statue of Apollo at Tamassos in Cyprus. H. Hagendahl, *Notes critiques sur le texte de Caelius Aurelianus*. K. Hanell, *Bemerkungen zu der politischen Terminologie des Sallustius*. T. Kleberg, *Mango*: 'deceitful dealer' > 'slave-dealer' (usual sense) > 'merchant' in Germanic languages. S. Lundström, *Textkritische Beiträge zur lateinischen Irenäusübersetzung*. M. P. Nilsson, *Mobiles rivi* (*Hor. Od. i. 7. 14*) are irrigation channels. D. Norberg, *Adnotationes criticae ad epistulas Gregorii Magni*. G. Rudberg, *Zu Pindaros' Religion*: P. felt both the bright fascination and the dark mystery of the gods. G. Thörnell, *Aenigmata*: on *Cic. Att. xiii. 30. 1* (reads *quom modo*), *xiv. 5. 1* (defends *balneatore* by reading *aquarius* in *Val. Max. ix. 5. 1*), *xv. 5. 1*. (interprets *ναῦς ἀφθρακες* as 'the ship of state is burned' rather than 'I have burnt my boats'). A. Wistrand, *Eine Randbemerkung zu Löfstedts Syntactica*: on pleonastic *ἐν* with *τί, ἐί μὴ, ἐί καί, ἐί, ἀλλ'*, *πλὴν ἀλλ'*, *ἤ, ἐπειδή*, and interrogatives (often wrongly emended). E. Wistrand, *Der Pontus und die Syrtis*: proposes *totidem sunt* in *Val. Flacc. iv. 711*, and shows that the Syrtis were supposed to receive water from the Sicilian and Cretan seas.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Baalbek-Palmyra.** Photographs by Hoyningen-Huene, with text by D. M. Robinson. Pp. 136. New York: J. J. Augustin, 1946. Cloth, \$7.50.
- Balmori (C. H.).** Euripides: Las Fenicias. Texto, traducción, introducción y notas. Pp. 553. Tucumán, Argentina: Universidad Nacional, 1946. Paper, \$18.
- Beukers (C.).** Cicero's Godsdiensstigheid. Pp. xvi + 224. Nijmegen: Dekker en Van de Vegt, 1942. Paper, fl. 5.60.
- Bignone (E.).** Il libro della letteratura latina. Storia della letteratura latina con una scelta delle più belle pagine dei maggiori scrittori in proprie traduzioni. Vol. I: La letteratura dell'età della repubblica. Quarta ed. Pp. viii + 190. Vol. II: La letteratura dell'età imperiale sino a tutta l'età di Traiano. Seconda ed. Pp. 258. Vol. III: La letteratura dell'età imperiale da Adriano alla fine dell'età classica. Seconda ed. Pp. 140. Florence: Le Monnier, 1946, 1946, 1947. Paper, L. 160, 180, 100.
- Bignone (E.).** Storia della letteratura latina. Vol. I: Originalità e formazione dello spirito romano; l'epica e il teatro dell'età della repubblica. Seconda edizione riveduta. Pp. xii + 599. Vol. II: La prosa romana sino all'età di Cesare; Lucilio; Lucrezio; Catullo. Pp. 470. Florence: Sansoni, 1946, 1945. Paper, L. 450 each.
- Bónis (E.).** Die Kaiserzeitliche Keramik von Pannonien (ausser den Sigillaten). I: Die Materialien der frühen Kaiserzeit. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. II, No. 20.) Pp. 268; figs., 10 plates. Budapest: University, 1942. Paper, pengő 50.
- Bourne (F. C.).** The Public Works of the Julio-Claudians and Flavians. Pp. v + 76. Princeton, N.J.: Privately printed. Paper.
- Carmina Hoeffftiana.** (1) A. Bartoli: De Hodierna Poesi Sermo; (2) H. Weller: Campana Sollemnis. Pp. 12 + 20. Amsterdam: Kon. Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1946. Paper.
- Carpenter (R.).** Folk Tale, Fiction and Saga in the Homeric Epics. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. XX.) Pp. 198. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1946. Cloth, 14s. net.
- Chase (A. H.) and Phillips (H.).** A New Introduction to Greek. Pp. vi + 128. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1946. Paper, 10s. net.
- Daube (D.).** Studies in Biblical Law. Pp. viii + 328. Cambridge: University Press, 1946. Cloth, 21s. net.
- den Boer (W.).** De Allegorese in het Werk van Clemens Alexandrinus. Pp. 161. Leiden: Brill, 1940. Paper, 3.15 g.
- de Zulueta (F.).** The Institutes of Gaius. Part I: Text with Critical Notes and Translation. Pp. viii + 305. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers.** Number 3. By E. Kitzinger, M. V. Anastos and H. Bloch. Pp. 224; 258 ill. on plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1946. Cloth and boards, 42s. net.
- Dunkin (P. S.).** Post-Aristophanic Comedy. Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at both Athens and Rome. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XXXI, Nos. 3-4.) Pp. 192. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Paper, \$2.50.
- Ehrenberg (V.).** Aspects of the Ancient World. Pp. ix + 256. Oxford: Blackwell, 1946. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Enk (P. J.).** Sex. Propertii elegiarum liber I. Pars prior prolegomena et textum continens. Pp. 162. Pars altera commentarium continens. Pp. 210. Leiden: Brill, 1946. Paper, 11 g.
- Festugière (A. J.).** Épicure et ses dieux. Pp. xv + 134. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1946. Paper, 90 fr.
- Fletcher (F.).** Our Debt to the Classics: a Retrospect. (Classical Association Presidential Address, 1946.) Pp. 30. London: Oxford University Press, 1946. Paper, 8d. net.
- Garrod (H. W.).** Scholarship: its Meaning and Value. (J. H. Gray Lectures, 1946.) Pp. 79. Cambridge: University Press, 1946. Cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Garvin (J. N.).** The Vitas Sanctorum Patrum Emeretensium. Text and translation, with an introduction and commentary. (Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Language and Literature, Vol. XIX.) Pp. vii + 567. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1946. Paper.
- Grazebrook (O. F.).** Nicanor of Athens. The autobiography of an unknown citizen. Pp. xviii + 359. Cambridge: University Press, 1946. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Handford (S. A.).** The Latin Subjunctive: its Usage and Development from Plautus to Tacitus. Pp. 184. London: Methuen, 1947. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Herrick (M. T.).** The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. XXXII, No. 1.) Pp. 117. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Paper, \$1.50.
- Hutton (J.).** The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXVIII.) Pp. xi + 822. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1946. Cloth, \$5.
- Jones (W. H. S.).** Philosophy and Medicine in Ancient Greece. With an Edition of *περί ἀρχαῆς ἰατρικῆς*. (Bulletin of the History of Medicine, Supplement No. 8.) Pp. 100. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1946. Paper, \$2.
- Knight (W. F. J.).** Poetic Inspiration. An Approach to Virgil. Pp. 56. Exmouth: Raleigh Press, 1946. Paper, 2s.

- Knudtson* (E. J.) Aus der Papyrussammlung der Universitätsbibliothek in Lund. IV: Bakchiastexte und andere Papyri. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1945-46, III.) Pp. 16; 8 plates. Lund: Gleerup, 1946. Paper.
- Knudtson* (E. J.) Bakchiastexte und andere Papyri der Lunder Papyrussammlung mit Kommentar herausgegeben. Pp. 139: 6 plates. Lund: Ohlsson, 1946. Paper, 10 kr.
- Laureae Aquincenses memoriae Valentini Kuzsinszky dicatae*, II. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Series 2, No. 11.) Pp. 347; portrait, figs., 61 plates. Budapest: University, 1941. Paper, pengő 60.
- Mackail, John William, 1859-1945.* (From Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXI.) Pp. xi; portrait. London: Oxford University Press, 1946. Paper, 2s. net.
- Metzger* (B. M.) Lexical Aids for Students of New Testament Greek. Pp. ix+110. Princeton, N.J.: privately printed, 1946. Paper, 5s.
- Murray* (G.) Greek Studies. Pp. 231. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Percy* (E.) Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Ephesierbriefe. (Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, XXXIX.) Pp. xvii+517. Lund: Gleerup, 1946. Paper.
- Perek* (F. Z.) Lâtinçe-Türkçe Sözlük. Fasikül I. Pp. 112. İstanbul: Üniversite Matbaası Komandit Şti. Beyoğlu Tünelbaşı, 1946. Paper.
- Pickard-Cambridge* (A. W.) The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens. Pp. 288; 141 figs., 3 plans. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Rand* (E. K.) and others. Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae volumen II, quod in Aeneidos libros I et II explanationes continet. Pp. xxi+509. Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press (for the American Philological Association), 1946. Cloth, \$5.
- Shard* (S.) The Use of Color in Literature. A Survey of Research. (Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 90, No. 3.) Pp. 87. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1946. Paper, \$1.25.
- Stein* (A.) Die Reichsbeamten von Dazien. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. I, No. 12.) Pp. 131. Budapest: University, 1944. Paper, pengő 30.
- Svennung* (J.) Compositiones Lucenses. Studien zum Inhalt, zur Textkritik und Sprache. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1941, 5.) Pp. x+204. Uppsala: Lundequvist, 1946. Paper, 6 kr.
- Symbolae ad Jus et Historiam Antiquitatis pertinentes Julio Christiano Van Oven dicatae* quas ediderunt M. David, B. A. Van Groningen, E. M. Meijers. Pp. viii+410; portrait, 4 plates. Leiden: Brill, 1946. Cloth, 26 guilders.
- Tod* (M. N.) A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the end of the fifth century B.C. Second edition. Pp. xx+266. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Vallejo* (J.) Tito Livio, Libro XXI. Edición, estudio preliminar y comentario. (Clásicos 'Emerita'.) Pp. cxx+157; ill. and maps. Madrid: Instituto 'Antonio de Nebrija', 1946. Paper.
- van den Bruwaene* (M.) Études sur Cicéron. Pp. 111. Brussels: l'Édition Universelle, 1946. Paper.
- van Groningen* (B. A.) The Poems of the Iliad and the Odyssey. (Med. der Kon. Ned. Acad. van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.R., Deel 9, No. 8.) Pp. 16. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1946. Paper, fl. 0.80.
- Vercoutter* (J.) Les objets égyptiens et égyptisants du mobilier funéraire carthaginois. (Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, tome XL.) Pp. xii+397; 29 plates. Paris: Geuthner, 1945. Paper, 2,000 fr.
- Webster* (T. B. L.) Restorations in Menander. (From the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 30, No. 1.) Pp. 31. Manchester: University Press, 1946. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Wikander* (S.) Feuerpriester in Kleinasien und Iran. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, XL.) Pp. xii+244. Lund: Gleerup, 1946. Paper.
- Wistrand* (E.) Nach innen oder nach aussen. Zum geographischen Sprachgebrauch der Römer. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift LII, 1946: 1.) Pp. 55. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerber, 1946. Paper, kr. 2.50.

Paper,

Studien
e. (Upp-
x+204.

s pertin-
tae quas
oningen,
4 plates.

rical In-
ury B.C.
: Claren-

Edición,
(Clásicos
d maps.
'a', 1946.

ron. Pp.
e, 1946.

lliad and
cad. van
, Deel 9,
-Holland

gyptisants
(Biblio-
me XL.)
er, 1945.

enander.
Library,
niversity

sien und
anistiska
Pp. xii+

en. Zum
Römer.
1946: 1.)
er, 1946.